



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR

U 21
. D3
1968

THE
EVOLUTION OF WAR

A STUDY OF ITS RÔLE IN EARLY
SOCIETIES

BY
MAURICE R. DAVIE
*Associate Professor of the Science of Society
in Yale University*

KENNIKAT PRESS, INC./PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y.

INDIANA
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

NORTHWEST

TO

PROFESSOR ALBERT GALLOWAY KELLER

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR

Copyright 1929 by The Yale University Press
Reissued in 1968 by Kennikat Press
Library of Congress Catalog Card No: 68-15822
Manufactured in the United States of America

PREFACE

FACTS," Mr. Owen D. Young has said, "are our scarcest raw material." Nowhere perhaps is this more apparent than in the broad field of international relations, where ignorance has long been the rule and enlightened understanding the exception. Assertions with respect to war have emanated from philosophers, clergymen, journalists, publicists, sentimentalists, peace advocates, apologists of war, and a host of others. Their views as to the causes of war, the history of conflict, and the outlook for the future are usually dogmatically stated. When placed side by side they appear inconsistent and contradictory. They have one thing in common: they lack the basis of fact. It is so much easier and more alluring to speculate as to the how and why of war than to grub for the facts.

Any inductive study of war should begin with the earliest evidence of its existence and trace the course of its development. The following represents an attempt to study scientifically the origins and early stages of the evolution of war. For reasons mentioned elsewhere no effort is made to bring the study of war down to modern times except to point out the bearings that different factors have on later stages. Aside from the advantages of studying war in its lowest terms, it must be obvious to the reader that a lifetime is too short and one's ability too limited to make a complete investigation of so tremendous a subject. A preliminary study was made some years ago in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the Yale Graduate School. This has been revised and expanded to its present form.

This book is designed for the general reader as well as for the special student. For the benefit of the latter a great many instances concerning various aspects of primitive warfare and primitive society are given in full in appendices. This collection of cases, so the author has been told, is exceptional; there is nothing similar in print. Sufficient cases have been left in the text to sub-

stantiate the positions taken and to enlighten the reading by actual, vivid, and sometimes rather amusing, examples.

I wish to express my thanks to Mr. Victor A. Rapport for his many criticisms and suggestions, and to Dean Clarence W. Mendell and Mr. George Parmly Day for their kindly interest and assistance in publication. My indebtedness to Professor Keller can be acknowledged only in small measure by the dedication. To my colleague, Prof. George Peter Murdock, I owe a heavy debt of gratitude. He gave unsparingly of his time to a revision of the manuscript and was most helpful both in a literary and in a scientific way. I appreciate more than I can say the large share he has had in this enterprise and the delightful, though industrious, hours we spent together.

M. R. D.

New Haven, Conn.

August 1, 1929.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction: Prehistoric Warfare	1
II. War and the Competition of Life	9
III. War the Business of One Sex	23
IV. Where War Exists and Where It Does Not	46
V. Cannibalism and War	65
VI. War for Land and Booty	76
VII. War and Women	96
VIII. Religion as a Cause of War	103
IX. Blood Revenge	120
X. Human Sacrifice	130
XI. Head-Hunting	136
XII. War for Glory	147
XIII. War and the State	160
XIV. The Mitigation of War	176
XV. The Stress toward Peace	196
XVI. War as a Factor in Societal Evolution	219
Appendices:	
A. Ethnocentrism and Tribal Names	234
B. Initiation Ceremonies	237
C. Instances of Mild Warfare	244
D. Warlikeness	251
E. Warlike Tribes in Africa	255
F. Instances of Serious Warfare	258
G. War for Booty	265
H. Blood Revenge	268
I. War Adornment	278
J. Trophies and Mutilation of the Slain	282
K. The Regulative System of Primitive Society	285
L. The Declaration of War	292
M. Torture of Prisoners of War	297
References to Chapters	300
References to Appendices	353
Bibliography	369
Index	387

THE EVOLUTION OF WAR

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PREHISTORIC WARFARE

FROM earliest times to the present, man has always fought and has always had weapons, both natural and artificial, with which to decide his conflicts. Of the various lines of evidence supporting this conclusion, that of written history admittedly shows man's tremendous preoccupation with war. Another indication is furnished by traditions handed down from an age before the art of writing was known, traditions partly mythical but also partly historical—mixtures of real memory and mythic fancy. The study of comparative mythology has added many indubitable facts about early man.¹ As Tylor² has said, "What the poet relates may be fiction, what he mentions is apt to be history." Bearing in mind this difference between the theme and the setting, many authors have reconstructed for us the life which these ancient peoples lived. Mythologies abound in recitals of wars and the superhuman deeds of warriors, and in them war holds the chief interest in life. Though the events related must be discounted, incidental details as to weapons, mode of warfare, and the like—facts which belong to the setting rather than to the theme—supply us with invaluable information.

Another source of information is the study of ethnology, or the customs, beliefs, and characteristics—in short, the culture—of less civilized races of the past and present who are unable to give a written account of themselves. Although the practice of restricting ethnology to a study of the cruder cultures of peoples without a knowledge of writing may be somewhat illogical and artificial, it serves many practical purposes.³ This source of information is of the greatest value and importance in any sociological study, as it offers "distance and detachment." The customs, mores, and natures of uncivilized peoples may be studied objectively and even dissected, as our own culture cannot be, since we are both the

observers and the observed. Moreover, since the primitive condition of mankind was one of utter barbarism from which some peoples have independently raised themselves,⁴ the study of less civilized races is of peculiar value; it shows social factors in their elementary and primitive forms and gives a basis for scientific study free from bias, moral judgments, and *a priori* assertions.⁵ As Wissler⁶ expresses it, "One of the great values to be derived from the study of different peoples is the attainment of a perspective, or a horizon, from which we begin to see our own culture from the outside." The old doctrine that savages have degenerated from a "golden age" of higher civilization has been definitely disproved by Lyell,⁷ Tylor,⁸ and Lubbock.⁹ While there are cases in which nations have retrograded, existing savages are not the descendants of civilized ancestors.¹⁰ In fact, culture is a worldwide phenomenon, and "the somewhat naïve distinction that is usually drawn between primitive cultures and those of the historical nations is an arbitrary one, so far as the real characteristics of the phenomena are concerned."¹¹ "Who is there," asks Goldenweiser,¹² "to tell us where civilization ends and the original nature of man begins, or what would be left of man were civilization removed?" Lippert,¹³ in support of the ethnological method of studying the evolution of society, says: "When we see developing in one group as a product of known factors a custom which has existed in another group since prehistoric times, we may fill out the prehistory of the latter on the basis of our knowledge of the former. The universality of this method affords us the assurance that we are not going astray in applying it." As the bulk of this volume is concerned with primitive warfare, suffice it for the present to say, with Spencer,¹⁴ that "in the lives of savages and barbarians the chief occurrences are wars."

Prehistoric archaeology makes it possible to reconstruct an earlier stage in the evolution of society than that represented by existing savage tribes, and to find still more primitive traces of warfare. The records here consist chiefly in the artifacts. These are of peculiar value, for "we cannot have more certain evidence of man's existence than the implements which he has shaped and used."¹⁵ Practically everything else, save some cave art and a few

human remains, has long since perished.¹⁶ While prehistoric man left no account of his warfare, he did leave behind weapons which testify that he fought and that he was no mean adversary.

That primeval man made use of weapons is but natural, for, after the quest for food, his greatest need was to defend himself. "The savage has to drive off the wild beasts which attack him, and in turn he hunts and destroys them. But his most dangerous foes are those of his own species, and thus in the lowest known levels of civilization war has already begun, and is carried on against man with the same club, spear, and bow used against wild beasts."¹⁷ The very earliest weapon was undoubtedly the stick or stone picked up at random and as occasion demanded.¹⁸ We must assume that primitive man took this step in his self-defense, since even apes use sticks and throw stones at those who intrude upon them.¹⁹ "It seems, then, that the Pliocene precursor, if we suppose him ever so little more intelligent than the modern chimpanzee, would have no difficulty, when he crossed the boundary and became human, in arming himself with the following weapons . . . rough shillelughs of wood, some for throwing and others for use in the hand; lances and spears of bamboo, and later of wood hardened in fire. . . . He might also possess throwing-stones. Unfortunately, if the reader will glance over this list of weapons, the only tool which we could possibly expect to recognize after a thousand years would be the stones. Everything else is perishable and would vanish, leaving no trace of his real armoury."²⁰

The stone casually picked up afforded an effective missile as well as something to strike with, and it is used in this primitive way by many savages today.²¹ When man discovered the art of chipping and fashioning his implements, he came to possess better weapons and developed into a more dangerous fighter. Of all stones, the most utilizable is flint, because of its hardness and mode of fracture. Other stones, and also horn and bone were used by early man.²² To be sure, in his rudimentary culture implements were hardly differentiated, and almost any artifact could have been used for both purposes—as weapon and as tool. Among the finds of the Paleolithic or so-called Old Stone Age which were probably used as weapons, may be mentioned the following: stone

cleavers and knives; blades of reindeer horn, bone, and flint; lance heads of flint, bone, horn, serpentine, quartz, and other materials; and even the bola.²³ The bow and the ax, contrary to the opinion of the earlier authorities, were unknown in Paleolithic times.²⁴ Many of these weapons were undoubtedly used for other purposes than war, since they were relatively unspecialized.

The war club must have been one of the earliest weapons, though, being made of wood, it has left few or no traces. Hardly a savage tribe exists today which has not used or does not still use the club as a weapon, and we are forced to the view that Paleolithic man used a similar implement.²⁵ It was present in the armories of ancient civilizations and lasted on into the Middle Ages in Europe, "when knights still smashed helmets in with their maces."²⁶

The Neolithic or New Stone Age brought great improvement in stone industry. It was characterized by the technique of grinding and polishing, which produces a stronger and straighter edge, and by the introduction of new implements. In Paleolithic times polishing, in the rare instances where it occurred, was not a part of the shaping process as it became in the Neolithic. Even in the latter period, however, the new technique was applied only to certain implements, especially those of the ax class. The flint dagger or poniard—"the veritable *chef d'oeuvre* of Neolithic art"—a weapon apparently differentiated for use in war and the precursor of the sword, was always chipped rather than ground or polished. In this period the flint ax was invented and improved, the spear continued in use, the bow and arrow were introduced, and indubitable arrowheads of stone and bone make their appearance.²⁷ In the lake dwellings of Switzerland, northern Italy, and elsewhere, are found lance points of flint and bone, arrowheads of bone, flint, and other materials, battle-axes of serpentine, and flint axes and knives, all of Neolithic technique.²⁸ Among the prehistoric relics of Japan are stone swords or daggers, arrowheads, spearheads, and shields.²⁹ Not Japan alone, but India, China, Syria, and every country of Europe had its stone age, while the museums of London and Berlin contain many stone weapons of Mesopotamian and Egyptian origin.³⁰ The Stone Age continued

far into historical times among many Aryan peoples,⁸¹ while numerous savage tribes today are on a comparable stage of development.⁸²

That early man knew the meaning of war is also evidenced by his selection of community sites for the protection they offered and by the fortifications which he erected. In Neolithic times "village communities, more or less in touch, were spread like a network all over Europe, and perhaps all over Africa,"⁸³ and the strongholds constructed on water and land attest the insecurity of life. Of the former, the best examples are the lake dwellings of Switzerland,⁸⁴ though similar pile dwellings have been found in Italy, Germany, Austria, France, and elsewhere.⁸⁵ They were built chiefly for protection against enemies and rapacious animals, and their value for these purposes may be inferred from the cases of pile dwellers among savages today.⁸⁶

Among prehistoric land strongholds, Jähns⁸⁷ mentions barricades formed by trunks and branches of trees, hedges, or inclosures, and also walls of earth and stone. In early America, the most common type of fortification, as judged by the remains in the mound area of the United States, seems to have been the so-called hill fort, where defensive walls of earth or stone surround a peak or hilltop or skirt a bluff headland, as at Fort Ancient, Ohio.⁸⁸ In the western highlands of Scotland are found "vitrified forts," which may also be included among Neolithic strongholds.⁸⁹ It has been suggested that these were made by inserting wood between the stone blocks and burning it, with the result that the stone was partly melted into a firm vitreous mass.⁴⁰ Similar fortifications have been found in Bohemia, Belgium, Brittany, Normandy, and Lusatia. In Denmark, Meisner⁴¹ found relics of prehistoric fortresses, the older ones without, the later ones with ditches. An ancient fort of remarkable strength has been discovered in Korea.⁴² Similar remains have been unearthed elsewhere, and they all bear silent witness to days of strife and warfare of which we have no other record.

The so-called Bronze Age succeeded the Stone Age in some places and introduced many improvements in the instruments of warfare. Man had become acquainted with metals, a fact which

Schrader⁴³ regards as one of the great turning points in culture history. With bronze weapons came real warfare, for, as Elliot⁴⁴ says, polished stone implements may be useful in building pyramids and dolmens, but they are not very satisfactory as weapons of war. With the acquisition of bronze, war took on a more modern character. The same author maintains that the invention of bronze axes, daggers, and swords altered the history of Europe. In Egypt, "the Hyksos may well have owed much of their success to their bronze scimitars."⁴⁵

The value of bronze weapons lay in the fact that the metal provided a harder substance, took a sharper edge, and permitted a longer blade. Copper implements were used earlier and concomitantly, but the alloy was superior because harder and more malleable. Many bronze weapons, such as axes, daggers, arrowheads, and javelin points, were merely imitations of similar implements in bone and stone.⁴⁶ This is a typical example of culture inertia—the tendency of cultural traits to persist.⁴⁷ The bronze battle-ax, however, presents a new departure. It has three chief forms: the celt, a sort of knife, and the battle-ax proper. The celt was used for hand-to-hand fighting and throwing. The second form under the name of *Framea* was the oldest national weapon of the Germans. One form of the simple ax, used in the hand and also thrown, was the *Franziska*, the dreaded weapon of the Franks. The sword likewise makes its appearance in this period. Jähns⁴⁸ thinks it was the first weapon used exclusively for war. He traces its evolution from the knife, but according to Déchelette,⁴⁹ "The first swords of the age of bronze are only poniards, the blades of which, owing to the continual progress of metallurgy, have gradually been lengthened." Bronze poniards or daggers have been found in many places, and in Switzerland, Japan, and elsewhere there have been unearthed good specimens of bronze swords, which bear out the relation between the two-edged dagger and the sword.⁵⁰ Just before the Hallstatt period the dominant weapon was the leaf-shaped sword, combining the advantages of thrust and cut. Myres⁵¹ has described it as follows: "Its long flat tang running the full length of the handle and furnished with lateral flanges gave the structural security of a girder where this was most absent from all earlier blades. Its occurrence as far to the south-

east as Egypt, along with other mid-European types, all belonging to the period of the great sea-raids of the years about 1200 B.C.; in Cyprus where it was eventually manufactured locally; and as far west as Spain and Ireland, is the best proof of its efficiency as a weapon. From it were developed not only the specifically 'Hallstatt' swords of the tenth, ninth and eighth centuries, but the swords of the Greeks of classical times, and less directly that shorter Spanish sword which was eventually adopted by the Romans." With the bronze sword came accessories such as scabbards, chapes of swords, hilt guards, and pommels.⁵²

Defensive weapons undoubtedly existed much earlier, but as they must have been made of leather, wood, or fiber, they have, of course, disappeared. Since stone is obviously not adaptable to such uses, it is not until the Bronze Age that we find defensive arms among the artifacts. Déchelette⁵³ gives a full discussion of bronze helmets, cuirasses, bucklers, arm guards, and finger stalls. Munro⁵⁴ found bronze helmets and arm and leg guards in the ancient tombs of Japan. According to MacCurdy,⁵⁵ the bronze shield is practically confined to the British Isles and Scandinavia.

The use of iron constituted another great advance; iron blades could be made longer and stronger. It is not to be understood, however, that all peoples have passed through, or must of necessity pass through, the three successive stages of stone, bronze, and iron, which represent the archaeological reconstruction of European prehistory. In Africa, for example, the age of iron followed directly upon that of stone.⁵⁶

In the world of antiquity, it was during the domination of the leaf-shaped sword that bronze began to give place to iron as the material for cutting weapons. "Until some first-class site has been properly explored in Asia Minor or North Syria, certainty is unattainable at the most crucial points in the history of the new metal: but from the fragmentary material at present available, the following points seem to be made out. Egypt had occasional, perhaps accidental, acquaintance with iron as a rarity, from late predynastic times, and received Syrian iron as a precious metal in tribute under the XIXth Dynasty, but made no general use of the metal till Greek times. Babylonia had no early iron, and though Assyria had it occasionally from the thirteenth century onwards,

there was no iron industry there till later, and iron was mainly obtained from the highland district of Commagene between North Syria and Asia Minor. In Palestine, literary references presume that iron was in use as early as the eleventh century; and iron weapons occur at Lachish and other Philistine sites after the arrival of the sea-raiders at the beginning of the twelfth. In North Syria, an iron-using culture intrudes from the north-west in the twelfth century, and it is about the same time, after the collapse of the Minoan seapower, and of the old coast-land civilization of Cilicia before similar intruders from inland, that iron weapons become common rather suddenly in Cyprus. . . . In the north the 'leaf-shaped' swords are regularly of bronze, iron only coming into use gradually during the 'Hallstatt' period, and superseding bronze only at its close; later, that is, than in Greece, and later still than in Cyprus, where the weapons of 'leaf-shaped' type are in iron throughout, from about the eleventh century. Traces both of the older use of iron as a treasured rarity, and of its later use for tools and weapons, occur in the Homeric poems, but without precise clue to the relative dates of the passages. That eventually a great iron-working centre arose in Noricum, and repaid to Rome the north's ancient debt to Italian bronze, is undisputed; and it may be that those who introduced the 'leaf-shaped' sword into Cyprus during the twelfth-century sea-raids passed on the Levant's knowledge of iron-working to the north, by way of the Ægean or the Adriatic; but at present, priority seems to lie with the North Syrian source, with the possibility that this in turn may be found to be derivative from some other centre beyond Taurus, such as the Chalybes in north-eastern Asia Minor from whom early Greece obtained afterwards its finer quality of steel."⁵⁷

The chief iron weapons of antiquity were swords, daggers, and arrow-, spear-, and halberd heads among the offensive weapons, and hilt guards, pommels, armor, and helmets among the defensive arms.⁵⁸ When iron weapons had come into general use, warfare became more serious and frequent than ever before.⁵⁹ The iron sword was the weapon *par excellence*. Indeed, says Schrader,⁶⁰ the early poets were not unjustified in considering war as the child of the Iron Age, though it is closer to actual fact to regard it as a characteristic of all epochs.

CHAPTER II

WAR AND THE COMPETITION OF LIFE

WAR, then, is universal. It has affected every part of the earth's surface where men have come into contact or collision. A striking statement as to its prevalence among historical peoples is made by Novicow,¹ who quotes various authorities to the effect that "from the year 1496 B.C. to 1861 A.D., in 3,357 years, there were 227 years of peace and 3,130 years of war, or thirteen years of war to every year of peace. Within the last three centuries there have been 286 wars in Europe. From the year 1500 B.C. to 1860 A.D. more than 8,000 treaties of peace meant to remain in force forever were concluded. The average time they remained in force is two years." With the increase of the world's population and the growth of civilization wars have involved larger groups and entailed greater destruction. The present generation has just witnessed the most colossal struggle with the greatest destruction of human life that the world has ever known. It is quite pertinent to ask: What is the reason for this state of affairs? Why has the history of mankind been so bloody? What is the hope of the future? An answer to these questions can, it is believed, be found. The first step toward such an answer should be the study of war in its lowest terms.

Since war is so fundamental a phenomenon, its explanation must be sought in the basic conditions of life. One such life condition is land, for it is from the land that all means of subsistence are ultimately drawn. Man has had to struggle for a living, however, for there is no "boon of nature" or "banquet of life." Man did not find any endowment awaiting him, nor a feast set for an unlimited number; he did not meet with ease and plenty. In nature, on the contrary, he found a "hard-fisted stepmother," who would yield only what was extorted from her.² All the facts open to us show that man has won all the civilization he possesses by toil, sacrifice, and blood.

The struggle to win subsistence from nature was extremely hard at first. Man was greatly handicapped, for he possessed no tools and arts; he came into the world naked. But he had his hands and especially his brain, and he fashioned rude stone implements. Later, by the method of trial and failure, he gradually came to possess better tools and processes, with the aid of which he was enabled to extract more from the land. By these means the struggle for existence became easier. This relaxation, however, has always been held in check by another basic condition of life, the number of people to be maintained with these supplies—in a word, population.

The more the people to be maintained on a given stage of the arts and on a given amount of land, the greater the struggle for existence, for there are more mouths to feed with a limited amount of food. This struggle has ever been intensified by the tendency of population to increase more rapidly than the means of subsistence. It has been said that the aim of nature is apparently to spread as thick a layer of protoplasm as possible over the earth. Malthus³ was one of the first to notice the effect of these two opposing forces, and he expressed the fact by saying that means of subsistence increase at best in arithmetic progression, while numbers tend to increase in geometric progression, so that population tends to outrun and to press painfully upon the means of subsistence. His comparison of the two rates of increase was incorrect, but in general there is no disputing the Malthusian statement that the fecundity of the human race is such that, if no restrictions be placed upon the birth rate, numbers soon reach the limit of the available supply of food and are kept within this limit by starvation and death.⁴

The growth of population has been restricted, however, through the operation of another factor—the standard of living. The standard of living is the measure of the comforts and luxuries customary and habitual in a group, to maintain which the group will make every effort. It tends to check the growth of population in several ways, such as by deferred marriage, celibacy, and the deliberate restriction of offspring.⁵ The struggle, nevertheless, still remains, for, as Sumner⁶ has said, this world will always be

one of toil and self-denial because "two men cannot eat the same loaf of bread." It has merely changed its form; instead of a struggle for existence, it has become for some people a struggle for a standard of living. The standard of living is a factor which must be considered in the relation of population to land. This relation has been formulated into a law which reads as follows: Human population tends to increase up to the limit of the supporting power of the environment (land), on a given stage of the arts, and for a given standard of living.⁷ Increase of population varies directly with the stage of the arts and inversely with the standard of living. Herein is found the widest and most controlling condition of man's status on earth—the ratio of his numbers, on a given stage of the arts, to the land at his disposal.⁸ It is to such fundamental facts as these that we must look to find an explanation of war.

The struggle for existence has been carried on, not individually, but in groups. As far back in the history of mankind as we can go, we always find group-life of some sort, and it appears that men very early hit upon the advantages of association. Man has certain needs or interests, which can best be satisfied by living within a group. Sumner⁹ mentions four "great motives of human action," under each of which are interests that must be satisfied. They are hunger, love, vanity, and ghost-fear—the primary socializing forces. The chief of these is hunger. Association is a great aid in the struggle for existence, for it permits the performance of tasks impossible to the individual and obviates cancellation of efforts. It effects economy through a division of labor and provides insurance against the ills of life. It entails certain restrictions and limitations, but its advantages far outweigh them. It represents a case of what has been called "antagonistic coöperation," which consists in "the combination of two persons or groups to satisfy a great common interest while minor antagonisms of interests which exist between them are suppressed."¹⁰

By carrying on the struggle for existence together, each man profited by the experience of others. "Hence there was concurrence towards that which proved to be most expedient. All at last adopted the same way for the same purpose; hence the ways

turned into customs and became mass phenomena." To these Sumner gave the name of folkways. The younger generation acquires them through imitation of or inculcation by the elders. When the latter die their precepts are enforced by ghost-fear; "the ghosts of ancestors would be angry if the living should change the ancient folkways." When to this sanction is added the conviction that the folkways are conducive to societal welfare, they are raised to another plane and are then called mores.¹¹ The mores represent at any time an epitome of the group's struggle for existence and its prosperity policy; they are an indication of its culture in a technical sense.¹²

The struggle for existence is a process in which a group and nature are the parties. The group is engaged in winning from its environment what it needs to support its existence, and in carrying on this process the group-members are united in close association and possess certain mores in common. But each group, besides struggling with nature for its existence, has to compete with every other group with which it comes into contact; rivalry and collision of interests appear, and when these issue in a contest by force, we call it war. "This collision may be light and unimportant, if the supplies are large and the number of men small, or it may be harsh and violent, if there are many men striving for a small supply."¹³ Such a conflict is called the competition of life. It is therefore the competition of life which makes war, and that is why war always has existed and, unless other means of adjustment are found, always will exist.¹⁴

Primitive society consists of small groups, each inhabiting a particular territory. The size of a group is determined by the conditions of its struggle for existence, and its internal organization corresponds to its size. Expressed in other terms, "the group appears as an aggregate of individuals limited in size by its culture and the environment."¹⁵ The relation of primitive groups to one another, where agreements or special conditions have not modified it, is one of hostility and war. Outside his group, a man's life is in danger, for he is then a stranger, and stranger means enemy. As Tylor¹⁶ has said, "The old state of things is well illustrated in the Latin word *hostis*, which, meaning originally stranger,

passed quite naturally into the sense of enemy." A stranger is a non-tribesman, and a non-tribesman is an actual or potential enemy. This feeling is very prevalent among primitive tribes, who either kill all strangers or regard them with suspicion. There is plenty of evidence from ethnography to support this statement; a few typical illustrations follow.

Curr¹⁷ writes of the native Australians: "Strangers invariably look on each other as deadly enemies," and the Australians never neglect "to massacre all strangers who fall into their power." What Von Pfeil¹⁸ says of the Kanaka of Bismarck Archipelago applies also to the Melanese in general. "Any person," he writes, "from a village removed beyond the small district which the Kanaka looks upon as his home he considers a stranger, and consequently an enemy." Existence is so insecure outside of one's own group that "no Kanaka may, without risk of life, attempt to visit the district of a tribe with which his own is not on distinctly friendly terms."

In Africa is to be found the same state of affairs, augmented by extensive slavery and cannibalism. "There are places in Africa," says Macdonald,¹⁹ who spent twelve years there, "where three men cannot be sent on a journey together for fear two of them may combine and sell the third." It is said of the Ba-Huana that "any man falling into their hands is killed and eaten."²⁰ This practice is prevalent in many other districts of the dark continent. Dundas,²¹ writing of conditions in East Africa in 1850, states: "In those days a man is said never to have left his village to go far alone; no one could go a few miles without encountering others who were looking for someone to rob or slay." Other writers on East Africa report the natives as being suspicious and distrustful of all strangers.²² In British Central Africa, if a man visited another village where he was unknown, "he ran the risk of being there and then enslaved, even though of the same tribe."²³ Among the Nigerian natives, guests might be entertained, but would be robbed or enslaved on the road next day.²⁴ The difficulty of journeying in the Congo is vividly described by Weeks,²⁵ who states that "men and women travelling alone or in two's and three's in places where they are not known, run the risk of being captured and sold as slaves. Such defenceless travellers would hide by day and travel by night to their destinations."

This state of affairs gave rise to the curious custom among the Bangala that "when the canoe containing six or more men drew near to a town they had to beat a drum and sing to notify the folk of their com-

ing, otherwise they were treated as enemies and laid themselves open to attack. For a canoe of strangers from neighboring towns or districts to approach a town unannounced by drum or song was regarded as an act of war. If their coming were peaceful, why were they afraid to drum and sing?"²⁶ Livingstone²⁷ was advised by a native of Balonda to send a messenger ahead when approaching native villages. He found this precaution secured a peaceful reception, whereas under his former method of approaching unannounced he says, "I sometimes entered a village and created unintentional alarm." Similarly "in ancient times the painted British savage on approaching a village sounded a horn to warn the villagers of his coming, otherwise he would be treated as an enemy who tried to surprise them by stealth."²⁸

Even among the peaceably inclined Eskimos, "strangers are usually regarded with more or less suspicion, and in ancient times were commonly put to death."²⁹ The same situation prevailed among the American Indians. Cremony,³⁰ for example, writes that "an Apache is trained from his earliest infancy to regard all other people as his natural enemies." This is more or less true of the Indians in general, and especially so of the Seri. In South America, many tribes of the Amazon valley are so hostile to all strangers, on whom they wage war, that very little is known about them.³¹

General hostility to strangers was in evidence even among the ancient civilized peoples, like the Romans, Greeks, and others, though the tendency was away from it. The Greeks of Homer's day were not so barbarous as to consider all strangers enemies, but survivals of the old state of affairs are seen in the case of King Echetus, who slew all strangers, and that of the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians, who devoured guests relentlessly.³² Similar cases from savage tribes and ancient civilized peoples are obtainable, but the above illustrations should suffice.³³

The same feeling of hostility is entertained toward Europeans. The Australians viewed with alarm the arrival of Europeans and evinced a savage desire "to kill white strangers, on their first coming among them."³⁴ When Captain Cook discovered Savage Island, he found it impossible to establish communication with the natives, who came at him "with the ferocity of wild boars," and when Turner visited the island later, "armed crowds rushed down to kill him."³⁵ Travelers in Africa have reported a similar condition and have further stated that the natives' suspicion was based in part on experience, as a great number had been kidnapped by European traders.³⁶ Roth³⁷ has collected many instances of the kind of reception first tendered Europeans by

savage tribes, and from them he has drawn the following conclusion: "All this would tend to show that savages are, as a rule, averse to meeting foreigners of whatever nation or of whatever stage of civilization," although there are "a few instances on record where savages have treated strangers in a truly friendly spirit."

The above state of affairs has naturally resulted in the isolation of many primitive tribes, their ignorance of one another, and the great variation in their mores. Thus in East Africa, where the natives are unable to travel a few miles without being robbed or slain, the average native "knows nothing of the country except in his immediate neighborhood. . . . Natives living quite close to each other remain as perfect strangers." Our authority, Dundas,⁸⁸ a colonial administrator of wide experience, says that he has known this to be the case with villages not half an hour apart. Bock⁸⁹ refers to the voluntary isolation in which the Poonans of Borneo live, while in North Australia the seclusion of the tribes has preserved their primitive condition to the present day.⁴⁰ In New Guinea the native tribes are so segregated that "twenty-five different languages are certainly spoken on the three hundred miles of coast extending from Yule Island to China Straits."⁴¹ As an illustration of the extent to which the Kanaka of Bismarck Archipelago carries his physical exclusion, Von Pfeil⁴² states that "that part of the Gazelle-peninsula which is known to us, though only thinly peopled, is divided into no less than twenty districts, in each of which another dialect of the same language is spoken, all of which differ so much that, while the inhabitants of two neighboring districts may still converse together, those of localities further removed from each other have difficulty in making themselves understood when they happen to meet."

The constant state of hostility with their neighbors has so affected the condition of the tribes in the Naga Hills of India that only a very short distance need be traversed to find the language so changed that the village communities can scarcely understand one another.⁴³ The isolation of these tribes has also developed well-marked physical variations in almost all cases.⁴⁴ In Celebes quite recently many savage tribes were so isolated by the constant state of hostility that each had its own dialect.⁴⁵ The Mela-

nesians in general are likewise broken up into hostile tribes having no intercourse with one another and possessing as many languages as there are tribes. The Polynesians, who carried on more or less friendly intercourse with each other, have, by way of contrast, the same language in a whole group of islands.⁴⁶ When the Spaniards discovered the northwest provinces of South America, they found tribes living in close proximity yet speaking different languages.⁴⁷

Later we shall see the bearing of the conditions just described on the intercourse between tribes, the difficulties of early trade, and other matters of importance in the mitigation of war. So great a barrier to friendly relations is this primitive mode of existence that Ratzel⁴⁸ has said: "The most important step from savagery to culture is the emancipation of the individual man from complete or temporary segregation or isolation."

The above cases show the relation of tribes to one another to be that of isolation, suspicion, hostility. But within a tribe the situation is quite otherwise. Even though there may be class conflict at times, the members of a group have a united and common interest against every other group. This is the natural effect of the competition of life. Each group is carrying on a struggle for existence, and its members therefore have interests in common. But in its struggle it encounters the competition of other groups, to which its relation, as has been seen, is generally one of hostility and war. The collision of groups in the struggle for existence, however, tends to bind more closely together the members of any one group. Thus a distinction arises between one's own tribe and others—between the "in-group" or "we-group" and the "others-group" or "out-group."⁴⁹ Different sentiments prevail in regard to the two: between the members of the "we-group," peace and coöperation exist; their sentiment toward outsiders is that of hatred and hostility.

These two relations are correlative. "The exigencies of war with outsiders are what make peace inside, lest internal discord should weaken the in-group for war. These exigencies also make government and law in the in-group, in order to prevent quarrels and enforce discipline. Thus war and peace have reacted on each other,

and developed each other, one within the group, the other in the inter-group relation. The closer the neighbors, and the stronger they are, the intenser is the warfare, and then the intenser is the internal organization and discipline of each."⁵⁰

The members of the in-group are united by community of material interests, kinship, common speech, religion, customs, and mores.⁵¹ The most fundamental relationship recognized by primitive man is that of blood;⁵² in many cases everyone not a blood-relative is a stranger and enemy.⁵³ Primitive society, indeed, seems to be organized on two major principles: that the only effective bond is a bond of blood, and that the purpose of society is to unite for wars of offense and defense.⁵⁴ These two principles meet in the law of blood feud, the theory of which is that the blood bond constitutes a standing obligation to take up the quarrel of every tribal brother. This involves group responsibility, a characteristic of all primitive societies. What Nassau⁵⁵ writes of the West Africans applies generally: "Each family is held by the community responsible for the misdeeds of its members. However unworthy a man may be, his 'people' are to stand by him, defend him, and even claim as right his acts, however unjust. He may demand their help, however guilty he may be. Even if his offence be so great that his own people have to acknowledge his guilt, they cannot abjure their responsibility. Even if he be worthy of death, and a ransom is called for, they must pay it. Not only his rich relatives, but all who are at all able must help." How blood revenge, coupled with group responsibility, leads to incessant warfare will be described in a later chapter.

Since internal peace and order must prevail, so that the group will be able to present a united front against the enemy, quarrels and difficulties within the group must be settled amicably. In this way have arisen rights, laws, and institutions, produced by the same conditions that made men warlike toward outsiders. Rights have been defined by Sumner⁵⁶ as "the rules of mutual give and take in the competition of life which are imposed on comrades in the in-group, in order that the peace may prevail there which is essential to the group strength." The right to life is such an example. Like all rights, it was first expressed in the form of a

taboo, as, "Thou shalt not kill." It applied, however, only to group-members. It was permissible, even commendable, to kill outsiders; but within the group, murder had to be forbidden in order that the group might exist and unite against the enemy. Later property was brought under the taboo; "Thou shalt not steal" likewise applied only to group-comrades. All rights arose in this way;⁵⁷ indeed, they can arise only in the in-group, which is, therefore, a peace-group. It will be seen later how peace developed in the in-group and spread by the extension of the boundaries of that group. We are here concerned more immediately with the sentiments held in regard to in-group members as contrasted with those toward members of out-groups and how these attitudes lead to intertribal warfare.

There are two codes of morals, two sets of mores, one for comrades inside and another for strangers outside, and both arise from the same interests. Against outsiders it is meritorious to kill, plunder, practice blood revenge, and steal women and slaves, but inside the group none of these things can be allowed because they would produce discord and weakness.⁵⁸ The Sioux must kill a man before he can be a brave, and the Dyak before he can marry. Yet, as Tylor⁵⁹ has said, "these Sioux among themselves hold manslaughter to be a crime unless in blood revenge; and the Dyaks punish murder. This state of things is not really contradictory; in fact its explanation lies in the one word 'tribe.' The tribe makes its law, not on an abstract principle that manslaughter is right or wrong, but for its own preservation. Their existence depends on holding their own in deadly strife with neighbouring tribes, and thus they put a social premium on the warrior's proof of valour in fight against the enemy. . . . Not only is slaying an enemy in open war looked on as righteous, but ancient law goes on the doctrine that slaying one's own tribesman and slaying a foreigner are crimes of quite different order, while killing a slave is but a destruction of property. Nor even now does the colonist practically admit that killing a brown or black man is an act of quite the same nature as killing a white countryman. . . . The history of the notion of theft and plunder follows partly the same lines. In the lower civilization the law, 'thou shalt not

steal,' is not unknown, but it applies to tribesmen and friends, not to strangers and enemies."

How widespread this difference in treatment of one's own and others is, may be seen in the following cases. Ellis⁶⁰ has written of the Polynesians that "theft was practised, but less frequently among themselves than towards their foreign visitors." Thomson⁶¹ reports that in the matter of lying the Fijian drew a nice distinction. "It was a crime to lie to his chief; it was, if not a virtue, at least a title to public admiration to display something cruder than the craft of Odysseus to an enemy, or to a person not a member of his tribe. The maxim 'all is fair in love and war' was applied literally. To pretend alliance, and then treacherously to smite the ally from behind, was more esteemed than barren courage." The two different codes of morals are likewise reflected in savage religion. Thus the natives of Niué believed that the virtuous passed into Everlasting Light, the evildoers into Darkness. "The virtues were kindness, chastity, theft from another tribe, and the slaughter of an enemy; the vices, theft from a member of one's own tribe, breaking an agreement or a tabu, cowardice, and homicide in time of peace." Religion, in sanctioning the mores of the time, was a constant incentive to warfare among primitive peoples in general.⁶²

The difference between one's own and others is also exhibited in the mode of warfare, whether the quarrel is between relatives or family connections or is against strangers or descendants of another people. Among the Maoris of New Zealand, mild measures prevailed in the first case, while in the second it was "war to the knife."⁶³ War with one's own kind was early regulated, whereas any means at all were used against the others.⁶⁴ The two different codes of war and their development will be treated later.

The Australian has two sets of mores, one for his group-comrades or friends, the other for outsiders or foes.⁶⁵ "Between the males of a tribe there always exists a strong feeling of brotherhood, so that, come weal come woe, a man can always calculate on the aid, in danger, of every member of his tribe," but toward strangers there reigns inveterate hatred, and any means are justified in dealing with them.⁶⁶ Similarly among the natives of Torres

Straits, where "it was a meritorious deed to kill foreigners either in fair fight or by treachery, and honour and glory was attached to the bringing home of skulls of the inhabitants of other islands slain in battle."⁶⁷ Here is to be seen the element of vanity entering to strengthen the mores; it needs to be reckoned among the causes of war. The natives of the Chin Hills of India recognized two kinds of thefts: "those committed by persons living in the same village or belonging to the same tribe, and thefts committed from persons belonging to an alien tribe," which were dealt with differently.⁶⁸ Captain Butler⁶⁹ says that the Angami of northeast India are, among themselves, usually most truthful and honest; against outsiders, however, they are "bloodthirsty, treacherous, and revengeful to an almost incredible degree."

Among the native tribes of Africa can be found many similar instances, of which a few typical ones are here mentioned. Cummins⁷⁰ writes of the Dinkas: "Any virtues that are apparent in the relations between individuals of a community are quite lost sight of in the dealings of one community with another. In such dealings the only code that obtains is the simple plan, that he may take who has the power, and he may keep who can." Such a situation is by no means confined to savage communities but may be illustrated in the history of civilized nations as well. In dealing with members of the in-group, right, fair play, and the like have been in vogue, for there were mores which guaranteed them, whereas in the relations of groups or nations to each other, mores—international mores or law—have been only meagerly developed.⁷¹

The Bageshu, according to Roscoe,⁷² who lived many years among them, are "treacherous and utterly unreliable to persons outside their own clan," while Stannus⁷³ says of the natives of British Central Africa: "Stealing from other tribes was of course approved." Among the Nigerian tribes in West Africa, "it is wrong to steal from a fellow tribesman—especially one of the same town—although he may not be strong enough to have the thief punished, but it is no crime to steal from a stranger."⁷⁴ Of the Bangala of the Upper Congo River, Weeks⁷⁵ says: "In dealing with an alien it would not be considered wrong to rob, beat, abuse, or even to murder him, unless he had come

on a visit to some one in the town." In fact, if a native Bangala "stole from a stranger and lied wholesale to him he would be admired by his neighbours as a clever, sharp-witted fellow, but if he robbed his neighbour, or slept with his neighbour's wife without first paying him, he would be condemned by public opinion and regarded as one who had *bijalele bibi*, bad habits."

Even the peaceful Greenlanders, whose habitat has developed in them virtues of integrity and mutual confidence, and who seldom lie and never steal from one another, have a different conception of their duties toward strangers, especially if of another race. "We must remember," writes Nansen,⁷⁶ "that a foreigner is to him an indifferent object, whose welfare he has no interest in furthering; and it matters little to him whether he can rely on the foreigner or not, since he has not got to live with him. Thus he does not always find it inconsistent with his interests to appropriate a little of the foreigner's property, if he thinks it can be of use to him." A similar state of affairs is to be seen among the Ahts of British Columbia, where "an article placed in an Indian's charge on his good faith is perfectly safe, yet thieving is a common vice where the property of other tribes or of white men is concerned."⁷⁷ Of the Nootka Indians, Bancroft⁷⁸ has written: "Stealing is not common except from strangers"—a statement that could be made of many another tribe. Among the Araucanians of South America, "robbery is part of the daily life of the Indian. . . . Armed raids were constantly made on the neighbouring villages, and thus a continual state of warfare was kept up," but no stealing is permitted in the clan itself, and as a general rule everything is considered in common.⁷⁹

In regard to the ancient Germans, Caesar's famous sentence shows a similar sentiment: "Robberies beyond the bounds of each community have no infamy, but are commended as a means of exercising youth and diminishing sloth." Robertson Smith⁸⁰ has written of the early Arabs: "If a man was guilty of homicide within his own group, the act was murder and his nearest relatives did not attempt to protect him from the consequences, but the whole group usually stood by a man-slayer who had killed an outsider, even though the slain was of a brother group."

Corresponding to this sentiment by which primitive man distinguishes his own group from others, is his tendency to look upon his group as the center of everything and to scale and rate all others with reference to it. "Each tribe, or true national unit,

regards itself as superior to all others and holds its culture to be the best."⁸¹ To this view of things the name of "ethnocentrism" has been given. "Each group," says Sumner,⁸² "nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders. Each group thinks its own folkways the only right ones, and if it observes that other groups have other folkways, these excite its scorn. Opprobrious epithets are derived from these differences. 'Pig-eater,' 'cow-eater,' 'uncircumcised,' 'jabberers,' are epithets of contempt and abomination." When the competition of life brings different groups into contact, their mores are brought into contrast and antagonism; hence conflict is hastened. Thus the factor of ethnocentrism or group-egotism, which "leads a people to exaggerate and intensify everything in their own folkways which is peculiar and which differentiates them from others," is an important cause of war.

When the names which primitive people give to themselves are examined, it is found that most of them mean "men," implying that "we alone are men," that the rest are something else, perhaps not defined, but not real men.⁸³ Some examples, collected incidentally, are cited in Appendix A. This tendency of groups to exalt themselves in comparison with others is by no means confined to less developed peoples. The Hebrews, for instance, divided all mankind into themselves and Gentiles; they were the "chosen people." The Greeks and Romans called all outsiders "barbarians." The word *Deutsch* originally meant "people."⁸⁴ The Lapps call themselves "men" or "human beings."⁸⁵ The Arabs regard themselves as the noblest nation and all others as more or less barbarous.⁸⁶ The same feeling is not absent in civilized nations today. "Each state now regards itself as the leader of civilization, the best, the freest, and the wisest, and all others as inferior."⁸⁷ National pride and patriotism may easily lead to megalomania, jingoism, and arrogant contempt for all outsiders. As long as ethnocentrism prevails, peace will be the exception and war the rule.

CHAPTER III

WAR THE BUSINESS OF ONE SEX

THAT *homo* is bisexual is one of the most fundamental facts in the history of mankind. "The division of the human race into two sexes," said Sumner,¹ "is the most important of all anthropological facts." Its effect is to be seen throughout the entire social structure. It permeates every phase of human activity and is particularly evident in war, which has occupied so much of man's time and interest. War is the business of half the human race; this is necessitated by the competition of life and conditioned by nature.

The sexes are fundamentally distinguished in many respects. Physically they differ in structure and function. Marked psychological differences have also been asserted, but here the case is not so clear. In general, woman appears as the more passive, industrial, and adaptable to routine, man as the more active, militant, and capable of spurts of strenuous activity.² To what extent these differences are innate and to what extent acquired or cultural, is disputed. Certainly the social rôles of the sexes have been sharply differentiated throughout culture history, and their differences in traits of feeling and character are to be explained on these, if not on more fundamental grounds. Their interests have been antagonistic, and they have been surrounded by different mores. But whatever the nature of these secondary sex differences, the primary ones are inescapable. Women are the child-bearers and tenders of children. Moreover, they are, as a very general rule, smaller than men, even within the same race.³ Though there is great racial variation in this respect and though the physical differences between the sexes are probably less pronounced in primitive races than among civilized peoples, the fact is of great significance.

Much of the specialization in labor by sex rests upon sex differences. It is not maintained that all such specialization is con-

nected with the physiological characteristics of the sexes, for in some respects the division of labor is largely conventional, but broadly and fundamentally sex differences are the determining factor. The sexes are complementary and are capable of specialization and coöperation. The combination of a man and a woman is more favorable to coöperation in the struggle for existence than that of man and man or woman and woman, for in the former case the activities and natural abilities of the two persons complement and supplement each other. Behind and at the bottom of the division of labor by sex is natural necessity.⁴ Havelock Ellis⁵ summarizes the situation as follows: "The tasks which demand a powerful development of muscle and bone, and the resulting capacity for intermittent spurts of energy, involving corresponding periods of rest, fall to the man; the care of the children and all the various industries which radiate from the hearth, and call for an expenditure of energy more continuous but at a lower tension, fall to the woman. That is the general rule." Hence it is that, in the division of labor among primitive peoples, man's work is to hunt, tend the cattle, and fight, while most other tasks fall to the lot of woman. Expressed in other words, "The militant side of primitive culture belongs to the men; the industrial belongs to women."

Behind this division of labor is also the element of force, itself a consequence of sex difference.⁶ Owing to his physical advantages and his exemption from sex burdens, together with the discipline and organization he learned in pursuing the chase, in cattle raising, and in war, man early coerced woman and forced her to perform the tasks disagreeable to him, so that, as Crawley⁷ says, the subjection of the female sex is a general law of human history. When Robertson⁸ states that a Kafir wife is "a mere slave to her lord," he sums up a situation fairly true of primitive peoples in general, though exceptions are found here and there where women suffer few disabilities and may even hold important positions in savage religion and government.⁹ The subjection of woman Spencer¹⁰ found to be more pronounced, the more warlike the group or tribe. The position of woman is relatively good where her occupations are nearly the same as man's. But this is not usually the case

where the men are very warlike, for war—though there are exceptions to this—is distinctly man's occupation. Hence the status of women is much lower in a militant than in an industrial society and tends to improve in proportion as militarism gives way to industrialism.

A few typical cases of the actual tasks performed by the sexes will indicate the nature of the sex division of labor among primitive peoples. "A man hunts, spears fish, fights, and sits about," said an Australian Kurnai once; "the rest is woman's work."¹¹ This statement might have been made by almost any savage. Of the Australians in general, Curr¹² says, "The common occupations of the men are the manufacture of arms and implements, hunting, fishing, and occasionally war. The women generally procure and cook whatever vegetables are to be had; in some cases fish, collect wood for the fire, and manufacture the nets and bags of the tribe. On the march, the wife carries the youngest child and household effects on her back, in her right hand the stout pointed stick, five feet in length, with which she digs up roots, and in her left a lighted torch made of wood or bark." The man is unencumbered, save for his weapons.

In the Murray Islands, "the duties of the husband consisted in fighting, fishing, making houses, preparing plantations, etc., those of the wife consisting in looking after the plantation (weeding, etc.), fetching food and water, and the usual household duties."¹³ It should be especially noted how agricultural work, except its heavier tasks, is put upon the women, the men shirking it because it is monotonous, hard, and disagreeable. Of the western tribe of Torres Straits, Haddon¹⁴ reports that "occupations differ for men and women; the men fished, fought, built houses, did a little gardening, made fish lines, fish-hooks, spears and other implements, constructed dance-masks, head-dresses, and all the paraphernalia for the various ceremonies and dances. They performed all the rites and dances, and in addition did a good deal of strutting up and down, loafing, and 'yarning.' The women cooked and prepared the food, did most of the gardening, collected shell-fish and speared fish on the reefs, made petticoats, baskets, and mats." Among the Dyaks of Borneo agriculture is left to the women and children, while "the able-bodied men seek other and more congenial occupations, *i.e.*, either follow a war path, or journey into the far interior or plunge into the jungle in quest of its produce."¹⁵

A similar situation exists in Central Africa, where "the men do no work that is not connected with the chase or the manufacture of imple-

ments. All agriculture is carried on by the women."¹⁶ Macdonald¹⁷ corroborates this statement. "At an African village," he writes, "the work is done chiefly by the women; they hoe the fields, sow the seed, and reap the harvest. To them, too, falls all the labour of house-building, grinding corn, brewing beer, cooking, washing, and caring for almost all the material interests of the community. The men tend the cattle, hunt, go to war and, curiously enough, do all the sewing required on their own and the women's garments." Generalizing on the evidence, Letourneau¹⁸ says: "All over Africa man is a huntsman, a soldier."

The effect on the women of doing most of the manual work, particularly agriculture, and becoming mothers at an early age, is that "they soon lose the sprightliness of youth and in face and figure exhibit premature old age, while the men retain an upright form, springy step, and unimpaired courage right into middle age."¹⁹ Since agriculture and many of the arts were in women's hands, knowledge of them was disseminated through wife-capture and the seizure of women in war. Thus culture was advanced as a by-product of war.²⁰

Spix and Martius²¹ report of the Indians of Brazil that "while the man is solely occupied with the chase, war, and making his arms, all the cares of the domestic concerns fall on the women." Cases like these are typical of specialization in labor by sex, and to multiply them would be merely repetition; similar examples are to be found in many general books on the subject.²²

From the foregoing it might be assumed that the division of labor by sex is largely due to coercion. This, however, is only partially true; much of sex specialization is forced by necessity and the mode of living, and the assignment of tasks is actually more equitable than it seems. Many primitive tribes, for example, are nomadic—necessitating the transportation of the household effects—and also warlike; consequently the woman must be the beast of burden in order to leave the man unencumbered and prepared for any hostile emergency. When the Canelos Indians of South America moved, "the man always walked first with his lance in his hand and feathers on his head, whilst the wife followed meekly behind, laden like a pack-horse with the fruits, and often a child on her hip besides, and another dragging at her heels."²³ The Lenguas of Paraguay are also nomadic, frequently making journeys of from ten to twenty miles a day. On the march, the woman carries all the household furniture, pots, water jars, wool

and skins in a large net bag on her back supported by a tumpline. In her hands she carries a palm-digger, sometimes a reed mat, used as a roof, and occasionally a cat, a fowl, or some other tame animal, and, seated on top, the baby. The man walks in front, carrying nothing but his bow and arrows, for he is the food provider on the journey, as well as the protector of the family group.²⁴

Pinart,²⁵ referring to the similar division of labor among the nomadic Indians of Panama, has given the reason for it as follows: "If the observer will only reflect a little, he will understand that, whereas the man carries his weapons only, the responsibility and the safety of his wife and children are incumbent on him. The Indian's life is indeed surrounded with dangers; when traversing a savannah, or forest, a hostile Indian may appear at any moment; a tiger, a snake, etc., may throw himself upon the travellers. Therefore it is the man's task to be continually on the alert, to have his hands and his movements free, in order to be able immediately to take his arms and defend those who are dear to him." Likewise in Africa, "when men are travelling, either their wives or boys carry their bundles of clothes, whilst the men are armed and ready for any emergency or attack, either from man or wild animals."²⁶

Where the tribe is not nomadic but sedentary and agricultural, a state of continual warfare may force the same division of labor, the men acting as protectors. The Pima Indians of Arizona, who were constantly set upon by the aggressive Apaches, afford a good example. Russell²⁷ says of them: "The men may be forgiven for allowing the women to perform certain tasks in the cultivation of the crops that are usually considered the portion of the stronger sex when it is learned that this plan was necessary in order to maintain pickets constantly for long periods, and that an armed guard was the sole guaranty of safety to the villages. Every three or five days small parties of five or ten would come to steal livestock and to kill any individual that might have gone some little distance from the villages. Larger war parties came once or twice a month, though longer periods sometimes elapsed without a visit from the Apaches." Owing to the constant state of warfare among

the tribes of the Chin Hills in India, no one was safe, and "the women worked in the fields guarded by the men."²⁸

The Akikuyu men of British East Africa are now idle, since the *pax Britannica*, in abolishing war, has deprived them of their former occupation of guarding the women working in the fields. Formerly, "even in days of comparative peace, a band of their male belongings would always have been seen grouped on some hilltop near at hand, watching, ready armed, for the slightest signal of distress," whereas now the women work in the fields without protection, and the men do nothing at all.²⁹ The same cause has had a different effect among the Bechuanas. The suppression of guns and ammunition has not only decreased fighting but has also improved the position of women, for the men now help them in agriculture. The reason is that the men never allow the women to touch the cattle, and since cattle are now needed in plowing, the men must do the heavy work.³⁰

The above relation of the division of labor to warfare depends, not on the degree of civilization, but on the exigencies of the situation, for in the recent world conflict women everywhere performed arduous tasks to which they were unaccustomed while the men were engaged in repelling the enemy and protecting them.

When any procedure induced by natural events becomes customary and habitual, it enters the mores and comes to be regarded as the only correct way, and the opposite is scorned. The mores are then frequently crystallized into adages or proverbs. "A man should drink, fight, and hunt, and the portion for women and slaves is work" is an adage of the Siyins, and all the Chins live as closely as possible in accordance with its sentiment.³¹ Before the Europeans came to New Zealand the native men looked to war as their sole occupation, and the women and young people cultivated the fields. "We were a strong and healthy people then," said a Maori chief, complaining of the changed situation.³² The great grievance of the New Caledonians against French authority and the missionaries is that they are restrained from fighting. "We are no longer men," they say, "since we do not fight."³³

This sentiment is typical of warlike peoples in all places and times. The Arab today would consider it a disgrace to engage in

any manual labor. "He is essentially a hunter, a robber, and a warrior, and, after caring for his cattle, devotes all his energies to slave-hunting and war."³⁴ The Homeric poet makes Odysseus declare that war is the proper work of man from youth even to old age.³⁵ Among the classical peoples the most honorable occupations were fighting, ruling, and ecclesiastical functions. This is the militant theory of the comparative worth of social functions; it expresses logically and properly the standpoint of fighting men as the predominant and most important class in the community.³⁶

Correlative with this view of the proper work for man is the contempt with which any other kind of work, particularly woman's work, is regarded. The element of vanity is very evident here, for fighting, cattle raising, and hunting are the "noble" and "honorable" occupations, while others are fit only for slaves. Hence it is degrading to do woman's work. So think the men of Torres Straits, and when Haddon³⁷ purposely asked them whether they made mats, they scornfully referred to that as "woman's work." When the Iroquois denationalized the Delawares and prohibited them from going to war, the latter were, according to the Indian notion, "made women," and were henceforth to confine themselves to pursuits appropriate to women.³⁸ Among the Pomo of California, when a man became too infirm to be a warrior, he was made a menial and required to assist the squaws.³⁹ This was also true in Cuba and Greenland, with the additional degradation of wearing female dress.⁴⁰ Since it is held degrading for man to do woman's work, prisoners of war and slaves are sometimes put at such tasks.⁴¹ Crawley⁴² thinks the custom of degrading the cowardly, infirm, and conquered to the position of females is due to contempt for female timidity. It seems also to arise from dislike of the monotonous tasks, especially agriculture, performed by women, the desire to shift the disagreeable work on someone else, and the additional factor of gratification to vanity.⁴³

Men's occupations, furthermore, are tabooed to women in many primitive tribes. The women are not allowed to hunt, touch the cattle, or encroach upon any occupation which the group's mores assign to the men. The sexes, moreover, are often segregated; they eat by themselves, have different food, often hold no intercourse,

and are surrounded by many other taboos.⁴⁴ These customs have a superstitious basis, for one of the underlying ideas is that contact with woman weakens man. Primitive man's idol is strength and power; he despises the weak, who are chiefly women. He is impressed only by might, and has little sympathy for the suffering.⁴⁵ This view is reflected in the cult; "frightfulness and force are the oldest attributes of the divine."⁴⁶ Women are despised because weak and timid, they are regarded as unclean, and they are thought to be able, by contagious magic, to impart their characteristics to others.⁴⁷ Thus the Khyongthas have a legend of a man who reduced a king and his men to a condition of feebleness by persuading them to dress up as women and perform female duties. When they had thus been rendered effeminate, they were attacked and defeated without a blow. "That," say the Khyongthas, "is why we are not so brave as formerly."⁴⁸ Since these characteristics attributed to women are fatal in the warrior, the greatest care and precaution are taken before and during war to prevent the fighting force from being weakened. Thus arise the taboos to the warriors of woman's food and of intercourse with women before the military expedition sets out, as well as the actions of the women while the men are away and other similar customs.⁴⁹

As stated above, war is distinctly man's business, and is confined to the one sex. This is so generally true that the few instances of woman's participation in war will stand out by contrast, as in the case of the Russian women's Battalion of Death in the recent World War. A number of Amazon myths exist, and both Briffault and Lippert⁵⁰ think them not without foundation. More important, however, are the actual cases of women warriors reported in ethnography. The classic example is that of the female corps in the standing army of the Negro kingdom of Dahomey, West Africa. The military system of Dahomey is exceptional among less advanced peoples in possessing a standing army and unique in having trained women soldiers. The female corps, commonly called the Amazons, was raised about the year 1729, "when a body of women who had been armed and furnished with banners, merely as a stratagem to make the attacking force appear larger, behaved with such unexpected gallantry as to lead to a permanent

corps of women being embodied.”⁵¹ This is the historical origin of the Amazon corps; its real origin or its condition of existence, however, lies in the fact that the women, who are a selected group, have a masculine physique, and can compete with men in enduring toil, hardships, and privations. At first the Amazon corps consisted only of female criminals, but later every girl in the kingdom was made liable, at the option of the king. Before marriage each girl was brought to the king, and if he pleased he retained her in the palace, the headquarters of the Amazons.⁵²

Captain Ellis⁵³ gives the following account of their military activity: “In both of the corps of the standing army, but more especially in the corps of Amazons, the military spirit is strongly cultivated, and they are taught to disregard obstacles, dangers, wounds, and death itself. Hence they often display a ferocious courage which carries all before it. Their chief aim in battle is to carry off a large number of trophies of their prowess, in the shape of prisoners, human heads and jawbones; and they care little for plunder. . . . The standing army fights with the ferocity and cruelty of savages, who have been intoxicated with a craving for military glory; it fights to conquer and to kill.” Besides cultivating the warlike spirit, strict discipline is enforced, and Amazons “who lose their weapons, or expend their ammunition without bringing back either a prisoner or a human head are punished.” These women are courageous fighters and have time and again surpassed the male corps in daring and ferocity.

Their military prowess was, however, at the expense of their natural instincts and functions, and they made good warriors because they were asexualized, or at least masculinized—which indicates that man is the natural fighter. By state policy the Amazons were considered the king’s wives, and could not be touched without danger of death. They were sworn to celibacy. Nature, however, will assert itself, and when Captain Burton visited Agbomi, one hundred and fifty Amazons were found to be pregnant and were brought to trial. Such offenders were always put to death in secret within the palace, with cruelties only whispered of outside. “In peace time one of the duties of the Amazons is to escort the palace-women when they go to the wells outside

Agbomi to fetch water. They, in common with the real wives of the king, never leave their quarters without being preceded by a bell, which is the signal for men to leave the road. The Amazons only meet the opposite sex when on the march or in the field; for when the two corps of the standing army parade at the palace, the sexes are kept apart by pieces of bamboo laid along the ground, which barrier no one may pass." It is under such conditions, then, that women have been warriors in Dahomey, the classical case of their active participation in war.

Of a tribe in Angola, it is said that in time of war "even the women will fight," but no details are forthcoming.⁵⁴ The women not seldom took part in war among the natives of the Canary Islands.⁵⁵ In South America there is a tribe of Amazons, so called, situated in the valley of the Amazon River, but the only information concerning them is that they are "a tribe of female warriors."⁵⁶ Among the Patagonians the women "follow their husbands, armed with clubs, bows, and swords; and ravage and plunder the houses of everything they can find."⁵⁷ In the province of Cueba, Central America, women take an active part in warfare, fighting by the side of their husbands and "sometimes even leading the van."⁵⁸

Among the Apaches the women were even more warlike. "Many of the women delight to participate in predatory excursions," writes Cremony,⁵⁹ "urging on the men, and actually taking part in conflicts. They ride like centaurs and handle their rifles with deadly skill." The fighting women are said to have been numerous, well trained, and desperate, often exhibiting more real courage than the men. Of the American Indians in general it may be said that women fought only at close range, using their knives or any available objects as weapons. In rare cases, however, women went to war and fought on equal terms with the men of the party.⁶⁰

In Hawaii, "the wives of the warriors often accompanied their husbands to the battle, and were frequently slain." They fought with spears, darts, and stones.⁶¹ When the Ainu, or ancient inhabitants of Japan, were at war with one another, all the men and women turned out to fight. "The women were left to fight their own sex, whilst the men fought with the men."⁶²

In Australia it very frequently happens that women fight with each other and sometimes against the men. Their particular weapon is the yam-stick, about five feet long, one and a half inches thick, and sharp

at both ends, used chiefly for digging yams, but also very effectively employed as a weapon when grasped and used like single-sticks. In their fights with their own kind, blows are given and taken which would soon render *hors de combat* an ordinary white woman, but which have comparatively little effect upon the gins. The men usually look on with complete indifference, but may sometimes interfere and stop the fight. "If, however, two men are fighting, the mother and sisters of each will cluster round him, shouting at the top of their voices and dancing about with a peculiar and ludicrous high knee action, as they attempt to shelter him from the blows of his adversary's boomerang or fighting club, with the result that they frequently receive upon their bodies the blows meant for the man whom they were attempting to shield."⁶³ Occasionally, in Victoria, when hostile tribes meet, "a woman begins the battle, scolding the enemy, and hitting the men on the head with a club."⁶⁴ Not infrequently the women tackled the men and put up a good fight, and Howitt⁶⁵ says it was not at all certain which would be victorious, for sometimes the women gave the men a severe drubbing with their yam-sticks.

When the Tasmanians resisted the war of extermination carried on by the Europeans against them, the women were "foremost in every aggression on the whites," but in their native wars the women took no such part in battle.⁶⁶ In the Kawen Archipelago, "the women form the rearguard, and laden with sacks of stone they hurl them over the heads of the warriors fighting upon their side."⁶⁷ Among the Bhils, a hill tribe of India, the women often accompany their husbands to battle and sometimes themselves face the enemy. They are armed with slings, in the use of which many of them are said to be very skilful.⁶⁸ In Timorlaut "women and children often take part in war," but there is no specific mention of the character of their rôle.⁶⁹ Of the Kiwai Papuans it is said, "Women always follow to the fight, and they kill outright with their sticks any who may be severely wounded. The women also do the looting. . . . The women themselves like it."⁷⁰

In early Arabia "women went into battle with the warriors of the tribe, an antique custom which was revived by the Meccans at Ohod, and in the heat of the fray no distinction of sex would be observed. We must think of the earliest Arabs as pure savages; the women followed the warriors, despatching and mutilating the fallen, and Hind at the battle of Ohod made herself a necklace and anklets of the noses and ears of Moslems and even gnawed the liver of her arch-enemy Hamza. When this was so women certainly would not be spared in hot blood, and even captives must at one time have often been slain."⁷¹

Women took active part in war among the early Germans, for when Marcus Aurelius overthrew the Marcomanni, Quadi, and other German allies, bodies of women in armor were found among the slain.⁷²

In High Albania at the present day there exists a custom allowing a girl to take up arms on the condition of celibacy. This is the only way a girl can escape the husband to whom she has been sold. "Should she resolutely refuse to be married to him she may, by tribe law, swear perpetual virginity before twelve witnesses, and she is then free and has certain privileges. . . . She may dress as a man and carry arms, and often does so; she may also take blood vengeance as a man does. . . . In all parts a sworn virgin is allowed to eat with the men and is treated as an equal, exchanges tobacco, and is generally 'Hail! fellow, well met!,' in striking contrast to the position of a married woman. No tribesman eats with his wife; and the odd custom still prevails of a married couple never addressing each other by name. To eat with a woman seems to be thought very degrading." The sworn virgin, in other words, makes a man of herself, and then of course it is fitting that she should carry arms. This practice of swearing virginity to avoid marriage with a man who is disliked prevails among the Moslem as well as the Christian tribes of Albania. Miss Durham,⁷³ who reports this custom, heard of a sworn virgin who had served in the Turkish army.

These cases have been cited in detail because they are so unusual. To counterbalance them with instances of men as warriors would mean the listing of practically all peoples of whom we have record. Instead of doing the actual fighting, woman participates in war more often merely as an auxiliary. As the pack horse, she is used in war for transporting the baggage, provisions, etc., as well as for preparing food and tending the wounded. Among the Ewe-speaking neighbors of the Dahomans, many of the men are accompanied in war by their wives and female slaves, "who look after the commissariat and carry the baggage." Among the Yoruba-speaking peoples in the same district, the men are "accompanied by a number of women, who cook the food and carry the baggage, so that the size of a war-camp affords no fair indication of the number of combatants it contains."⁷⁴ The Baganda women go to war "to cook their husbands' food during the expedition and to nurse them if they are wounded."⁷⁵ The Darfur women perform a different function in battle; "they stand behind the combatants and

hand to them lances heated in a brazier.”⁷⁶ This is the case also among the western people of Torres Straits, where in real war the women at once hide themselves in the bush, but “in scrimmages such as the marriage-fight, or when a small quarrel was to be settled by a fight, the women would stand a short distance behind their men and supply them with arrows and javelins.”⁷⁷ In the Canary Islands, “the women accompanied the men in war to prepare food, care for the wounded, provide new weapons, and promote courage in the encounter.”⁷⁸

In New Caledonia the women go to battle, but keep in the rear and attend to an unusual kind of commissariat. “Whenever they see one of the enemy fall, it is their business to rush forward, pull the body behind, and dress it for the oven.”⁷⁹ The women were active auxiliaries in the martial exploits of the Maoris of New Zealand.⁸⁰ The native women of Rotuma followed the men to war and administered to the wounded,⁸¹ as did the women in Samoa, where also occasionally a woman would follow close upon the heels of her husband in actual conflict carrying his club or some other part of his armor.⁸² In Hawaii the wives of warriors often accompanied their husbands to battle, carrying provisions and assisting them when wounded. Their action in this respect resembled that of the Society Islanders on similar occasions, when the women “generally followed in the rear, carrying calabashes of water, or of poe, a little dried fish, or other portable provisions, but they followed, more particularly, to be at hand in case their husbands should be wounded.”⁸³

The women and children of the southern California Indians accompanied the men on raids, carrying provisions for the march, and during an engagement they would pick up the fallen arrows of the enemy and by this means keep their own warriors supplied.⁸⁴ Among the North American Indians in general, it was only occasionally that women were of the war party. They were then not under orders, but acted as servers, and when the spoils were divided they were given a share.⁸⁵ In Central America, supplies were carried, in Yucatan at least, on the backs of the women, and the want of adequate means of transportation is given as one reason why the Maya wars were usually of short duration.⁸⁶ The Araucanian women usually followed the war party not far in the rear, and made themselves generally useful.⁸⁷

Among the more civilized Peruvians, “the married women who went along to war carried on their backs the food for their husbands.” The

soldiers had their tents in the fields and took their wives and children with them.⁸⁸ That this general arrangement was true of the ancient Germans is indicated by the statement of Tacitus that "the women also administer food and encouragement to those who are fighting."⁸⁹

With the great change in mode of fighting produced by the modern development of armament, the auxiliary part in war played by women today is very different from that of savages. Of the various tasks primitive women performed in the war area itself, the only one left is administering to the wounded in hospitals somewhat removed from the firing line. Modern women have, however, assumed new activities at home which were unknown to earlier peoples.

With these few exceptions, war is man's business, and the exigencies of primitive existence make it the most important factor in his life. First and foremost among the services which the savage man performs is that of defending his group and fighting its battles. This service is so important that a premium is placed upon the able warrior, and he is given a high place in the community. War among less-civilized peoples is not the business of a selected few; it is the occupation of every adult male, for which he is trained from earliest youth.⁹⁰ So necessary is it to group-existence, that the education of the youth is mainly aimed at fitting him for a warrior. The life of a savage may be divided into three stages: boyhood, warriorhood, and old age. The first is largely devoted to preparation for the second and most important, while the elders are the instructors of the boys.

The training of the boys in warlike activities begins at a very early age. It often starts with games in which, as Tylor⁹¹ has shown, children imitate the life they will afterward live in earnest. The Mayas of Central America encouraged their boys as mere infants to amuse themselves with warlike games and to practice with the bow and arrow. From early youth the Comanches were taught the art of war and the skilful handling of horses and weapons.⁹² The children of the Bororo Indians were instructed in the manufacture of weapons.⁹³ Among the Bawenda of Africa, "the little boys play at hunting or at war," while "the little girls imitate in play the household duties of their mothers, which very soon

will fall to their lot in earnest.”⁹⁴ As part of the preliminary initiation rites among the Bageshu, the boys, “shouting and dancing in their onslaught of the unseen foe,” attack, with any kind of missiles they can collect, the village where they are to be initiated.⁹⁵ In Nigeria the boys are taught to scout and take cover by practicing with stones. “Boys who have shown the right qualities in the sham fights with stones will be noted for posts as subordinate leaders when they grow up.”⁹⁶ Miss Kingsley ⁹⁷ says that in some districts of West Africa the boys “make raids so as to perfect themselves in this useful occupation.” Among the natives of Sarawak “certain ceremonies in which the youths take a leading part are directed exclusively to training them for war and the taking of heads in battle.”⁹⁸ The boys of the Euahlayi tribe in Australia tried their skill in sham fights. “They were given bark shields, and their attackers had bark boomerangs; great was the applause when the boys ably defended themselves. Previously they had been tried with boomerang and boodthul throwing, and other arts of sport and warfare, boys of each side trying to excel those of the other.”⁹⁹ The readiness with which boys today will form sides and engage in mimic battles represents a survival of the primitive games which had a more definite objective.

Primitive children, besides learning the art of war, are often inured to bloodshed. Bancroft¹⁰⁰ says of the Koniagas (Hyperboreans): “Their male prisoners of war, they either killed immediately or reserved to torture for the edification and improvement of their children.” In Fiji the children are often led “to kick and tread upon the dead bodies of enemies.”¹⁰¹ Among the Kavirondo of East Africa, “when people are killed in warfare, the victorious side endeavours to secure the bodies. The young warriors of the tribe who are just beginning to bear arms are encouraged to stab the bodies repeatedly with their spears so that they may become hardened to the sight of death and blood.”¹⁰² In Dahomey, where sacrifice of war captives prevailed on a large scale, after a war with the Whydahs “four thousand of the prisoners taken in the rout were sacrificed as a thank offering to the gods, their heads being struck off by boys, whom it was desired to inure to scenes of bloodshed. Some of these boys were only seven or eight years of

age, and the wretched prisoners endured protracted agonies at the hands of these child executioners, who had not sufficient strength to wield a sword."¹⁰³ Such facts as these scarcely bear out Letourneau's belief in a ferocious instinct in mankind;¹⁰⁴ callousness to human suffering is, rather, in the mores and is inculcated in the youths in the manner shown above.

The necessity of training the boys for their chief work in life has given rise to a group of rites and ceremonies which take place at the age of puberty. These are known as initiation ceremonies and are characteristic of most savage tribes. Occasionally we find ceremonies for girls, in which they are taught in general the household and other duties of their mothers, the share in sexual division of labor which will fall to their lot,¹⁰⁵ but these are in no way connected with war, for that is not woman's affair. The initiation or puberty ceremonies for boys aim, in a word, to prepare them for man's estate, and as war plays so large a part in their lives the chief feature of the ceremonies—the aim of their education—is the production of warriors who will defend the interests of the tribe. The initiation rites mark the completion of the period of childhood and the separation of the boy from the women and children. Hitherto he has helped the women and played with girls, but henceforth girls and women's work are to be shunned. As a preliminary to the ceremonies in many tribes, the women surrender the boys to the headmen or elders as a symbol of this change. The initiation ceremonies are made much of, neighboring tribes are usually invited, a special site for the occasion is selected, and the whole affair often lasts for weeks or months. The rites are generally secret, often religious; women are excluded, the novices are sworn to secrecy, and even Europeans are usually forbidden to attend. The boys are secluded during this period, are subjected to various ordeals, and are instructed in tribal wisdom and obedience.¹⁰⁶ The chief elements in these ceremonies, especially as they relate to war, are discussed in full in Appendix B.

A factor in the lives of so many savage tribes, the initiation ceremonies must have had great survival-value in order to have persisted. They have been of great assistance in creating tribal coherence and in strengthening the group for the competition of

life. It is probable that the group's united in this way have prevailed in the struggle, while those lacking such a system of social control have been eliminated.¹⁰⁷ Unity and coherence in the in-group are the first condition of group-existence in the competition of life, and the effect of continual war has been to solidify the group, develop discipline, and concentrate authority. The initiation ceremonies may also create strong bonds of brotherhood within the tribe, as among the Bawenda, where those who are initiated in the same year form a special fraternity and will not betray nor give evidence against one another, and among other African tribes where such initiates are formed into regiments. The permanent effects of the initiatory training are the preparation given the boys for their life work, the increased respect felt by the novices for the old men and their customs, the effective system of control provided by the religious rites which are among the most conservative of primitive customs, and the discipline and group solidarity produced by such means. With increasing social organization, the powers of control are gradually shifted from the elders to the chiefs, and tribal societies charged with important political and judicial functions arise on the basis of the original puberty organizations.¹⁰⁸ These tribal or secret societies, as will be seen later, exert an important influence among primitive tribes in preserving law and order in the in-group, and in some respects they promote the growth of friendly intertribal relations.

Other social effects arise from the fundamental part played by war in primitive societies. Since the tribe's existence depends upon its success in the competition with neighboring tribes, its members put a social premium on the warrior's proof of valor. Courage and warlike characteristics are highly esteemed. "The Negro," says Sir Harry Johnston,¹⁰⁹ "worships force, and has a sneaking admiration for bloodshed." Weeks¹¹⁰ writes of the native of the Upper Congo River: "If you are powerful he will effusively smile on you a week after you have unmercifully thrashed him, but if you are a nobody he will scarcely greet you the day after you have saved his life." "Reliance on the capable man is a very prominent trait in their character," says Phillips¹¹¹ of the Lower Congo natives. "A master of slaves, or the father of a family may be very

exacting towards his dependents yet they will support him devotedly if only he can protect them from outside annoyance. The lenient man is looked on with suspicion; they fear he has not spirit enough to properly resent aggressions, and their loyalty diminishes." Even the Andamanese, who appear totally lacking in the type of courage common to most tribes, admire greatly those who evince fearlessness, while poltroons are objects of general ridicule.¹¹²

The same feeling is shown toward whole groups, as in the cases of the Batlaping, perhaps the most degraded tribe of the Bechuana, who are despised by the more warlike and independent Basuto,¹¹³ and of the Manansa who are greatly disdained by other South African tribes as cowards.¹¹⁴ Few races, in a region where oppression has been the lot of the weaker since time immemorial, have had to endure greater persecution than the Yezidis of Mesopotamia.¹¹⁵ Such has always been the fate of passive as contrasted with active races,¹¹⁶ and no less a peace lover than David Livingstone¹¹⁷ asserted: "The pugnacious spirit is one of the necessities of life. When people have little or none of it, they are subjected to indignity and loss." Examples of the fate of tribes lacking in this respect will be given below. The warlike spirit in the mores and the honor and prestige achieved by those who excel in military pursuits are the considerations now most pertinent.

Military virtues held the highest place in the popular mind among the American Indians. "To die in battle was glorious; bravery, strength, and skill gave the most envied positions to their possessors, and cowardice was everywhere execrated. It was an easy matter to arouse the warlike enthusiasm of the boy, and among most tribes his early training was directed chiefly to that end. The child's toys were miniature weapons, and the games were usually contests which practised the boys in their use."¹¹⁸ The Comanches highly honored bravery on the battlefield; a warrior was not allowed a seat in the council until his name had been garnished by some heroic deed.¹¹⁹ The Natchez, like all the other nations of Louisiana, distinguished by particular names those who had killed a greater or lesser number of the enemy.¹²⁰ The Sia tribe of Pueblo Indians had a Society of Warriors, membership in

which was conditional upon bringing home such trophies as the scalp and buckskin apparel.¹²¹ The Kiowá had a similar warrior society.¹²² Among the Omaha, war honors were graded, decorations corresponding to the different grades were given, and there was a special ceremony of conferring them.¹²³ Among the Dakota, merit was apportioned by the nicest distinctions of costume: "Certain marks on the coveted eagle's feather denoted the warrior's title to esteem. The feather with the red spot on it signified simply that the warrior had killed an enemy; a notch cut in it, and the edges painted red, showed that the enemy had had his throat cut; whilst according as the notches were on one side or on both sides, or the feather partly denuded, it was understood that the warrior had been the third, fourth, or fifth in order, to touch the dead body of a fallen foe."¹²⁴ Of the American Indians in general it may be said that all rank was gained by personal achievement, but before a man could count his war honors, wear their appropriate insignia, or assume the grade or rank to which they entitled him, he had to be given the right to do so publicly and generally in connection with more or less elaborate religious ceremonies conducted by societies or by tribal officials. Among some tribes honors won in defensive warfare ranked higher than those gained in aggressive ventures. "As war honors were public tokens of a man's courage and ability, they were regarded as his credentials; therefore when a man was called to any position or service, either social or tribal, custom required that before he entered on his duties he should give his public record by counting his honors to show his fitness to receive the distinction offered him. Among some tribes, at the telling of each honor a blow was struck on a post or some other object, and this form of recital has become known by the composite term 'counting coup.'"¹²⁵

The Fijians had a developed system of war honors and a ceremony like an investiture of knighthood for prowess in battle. Every warrior who had slain an enemy was entitled to the honor, and every time his club was blooded the ceremony was repeated and a new name conferred. "In olden times the slayer of ten bore the prefix *Kali* (Dog), and the slayer of twenty *Visa* (Burn), but as the influx of foreigners began to check war, these honours were granted upon easier terms."¹²⁶ In each

district in Samoa there was a certain village known as that of the advance troops. "It was their province to take the lead and in battle their loss was double the number of that of any other village. Still they boasted of their right to lead, would on no account give it up to others, and talked in the current strain of other parts of the world about the 'glory' of dying in battle. In a time of peace the people of these villages had special marks of respect shown to them, such as the largest share of food at public feasts, flattery for their bravery, etc."¹²⁷

Warlikeness is deepseated in the mores of the Ponapeans, whose favorite passage in the Old Testament is the famous duel of David and Goliath, the translation of which is particularly spirited and happy in the missionary vernacular.¹²⁸ The sling, it may be remarked, is their favorite missile weapon. War to the Malays is the noblest occupation. The warriors are ranked and graded according to the number of brave deeds.¹²⁹ The distinction of warriors, as marked by adornment, tattooing, and the like, will be treated elsewhere more fully. The reception of warriors returned from an expedition also shows the esteem in which warlikeness is held. Among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo, "the women, singing a monotonous chant, surround the hero who has killed the enemy and lead him to the house. He is seated in a place of honour, and the head [the trophy he has taken] is put on a brass tray before him, and all crowd around to hear his account of the battle, and how he succeeded in killing one of their foes and bringing home his head."¹³⁰ At the annual feast and ceremonies of the tribes at Hood Point, New Guinea, only a girl whose father has taken life may wear his paradise plumes.¹³¹

Robertson¹³² speaks of an old man among the Kafirs who was "reverenced in the tribe because of the wonderful number of people he had slain." In a raiding expedition, "the advance was led by light-limbed young braves, with one or two of graver years, whose words were ever listened to with respect, for these men had terrible records, and one was covered with the scars of wounds." A favorite story among the Nagas of Northeast India, and one of which they are exceedingly proud, is how a certain chief, when down but still alive, reviled his opponent, who commenced cutting off his head in a bungling manner, for carrying a blunt *dhao* or dagger, saying, "Take my *dhao* which is always sharp and cut my head off properly."¹³³ In India also is seen the permanent social influence gained by a warrior caste. The Rajputs and Mahrattas especially, but also the Nayars and Prabhu castes, are warrior tribes which have exercised a commanding influence on the national history of India.¹³⁴

In Africa, too, is to be observed a high regard for warlike qualities. In Nyassaland, on attacking a village or fortified place, it is everyone's desire to break the *boma*, that is, to be the first man inside the stronghold. Such a man is highly esteemed and has certain privileges because of his act.¹³⁵ The men of the Upper Congo are armed on all occasions; an unarmed man is treated with contempt and is told to "go and rear children." It is considered a sign of weakness for either man or woman to express emotion and sensitiveness.¹³⁶ Among the Asaba people of the Niger, men who have killed one or more of the enemy are given a special name (*Obu*, literally "a killer") and are allowed to take part in the annual festivals. For every man they kill they plant a cotton tree, which constitutes a witness to confront any slanderer who dares impugn the bravery of the planter.¹³⁷

Among more advanced peoples militaristic mores are by no means lacking. One of the greatest insults which can be offered a Morocco Berber is to charge: "Your father died in his bed." In some districts the coward is paraded in a Jew's cap until he has retrieved his character by some brave deed.¹³⁸ Among the Avesta people, "it was an honor for a man at all times to be in fighting trim and warlike."¹³⁹ Whereas able men now go into the professions, they used to go into war. A few examples out of many are Solon, Epaminondas, Themistocles, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Caesar.¹⁴⁰ But where a civilized nation is highly militaristic there is to be found even today the same attraction to warlike pursuits and the same high esteem of warlike virtues. "In any society that survives by the military qualities," says Ross,¹⁴¹ "we find that all manner of homage is paid to the soldier type. Literature glorifies it, eloquence crowns it, religion canonizes it, multitudes applaud and cheer it. Everywhere that type is honored, revered, sung, and praised. Healths and toasts are drunk to the soldier; women smile on him; men bow down to him. Art, literature, oratory, worship, monuments, statues, festivals, commemorations, and observances unite in perpetually reminding men of soldier qualities, exploits, and prizes."

Although warlikeness is honored among primitive peoples, the deed may be far from courageous according to modern notions. The Fang of the French Congo will shoot down a person or two from ambush and then return to their town in triumph, shouting:

"We are real men, we are real men, we have been to town, we have shot a man (or woman), we are men—real men."¹⁴² The Asaba have already been mentioned as greatly honoring the slayer of an enemy, giving to the perpetrator of the deed the title of *Obu* or killer, but a person may become an *Obu* in three other ways: by buying a man and killing him, by killing a man when he is sick, and by killing a tiger or a leopard; though in these instances a money present has to be given to the other *Obu*.¹⁴³ The Batoka regard as brave a man who kills even boys.¹⁴⁴ Among the Nagas, "to kill a baby in arms, or a woman, was accounted a greater feat than killing a man, as it implied having penetrated to the innermost recesses of an enemy's country, whereas a man might be killed anywhere by a successful ambush." A certain Naga was highly regarded for having killed sixty women and children upon whom he happened at a time when all the men had left the village on a hunting expedition.¹⁴⁵ As will be shown later, the same thing is true of the head-hunting tribes of Borneo and other places, where honor is attached to the acquisition of a head, no matter whose it is. For the honorary names and investiture of knighthood mentioned in the case of the Fijians, slaying a child or woman makes a warrior as eligible as slaying a man.¹⁴⁶ These cases to the contrary notwithstanding, savages, when considered in their own setting, are no less courageous than their more civilized brethren. Their mode of warfare differs, because their weapons are different, and weapons have always determined the mode of warfare.

Warlikeness has also affected other institutions, marriage for example. A Masai is not supposed to marry until he has blooded his spear. The Karamojo youth must distinguish himself in war before he may marry.¹⁴⁷ Among the natives of Papuan Gulf, a man must be initiated as a warrior before he is free to enter the marital state.¹⁴⁸ The Naga warrior has to bring home a scalp or skull before he is qualified to marry a girl—one who perhaps has been waiting for years, as Tylor¹⁴⁹ suggests, for this "ugly marriage-license." Among the American Indians the successful warrior was so esteemed that, among the Sioux for instance, a young man could scarcely induce a girl to consider him until he had distinguished himself in war.

No social institution stands alone. Each one influences and permeates all the others to a greater or lessér extent, depending on its importance. There is, in other words, a strain toward consistency in the mores.¹⁵⁰ For this reason any fundamental social phenomenon will be found to ramify throughout the entire social structure. War is such a basic factor. It influences and reacts upon other social institutions or other parts of the culture pattern in a striking and often confusing manner. Thus the simple fact that the men must defend their group has affected the division of labor by sex, the education of boys, social standing, and marriage. Moreover, as will be seen below, it has increased the power of the chief, influenced the development of government, and affected religion, which, in sanctioning the mores, promises better treatment in the next world for the warlike and elevates some warriors to the position of gods. Thus a treatment of war necessitates the introduction of a cross section of social life as a whole. The subject is divided into topics merely as an aid in presentation. Actually it constitutes an interrelated whole and is at the same time inextricably interwoven with the rest of the social fabric.

CHAPTER IV

WHERE WAR EXISTS AND WHERE IT DOES NOT

WAR plays a prominent part in the life of most primitive peoples and is usually a sanguinary affair, but there are a number of notable cases where it does not exist and others where it assumes a very mild form. The explanation of this variation is to be derived from what has gone before. War has been defined as a contest by force between political groups, arising from the competition of life. Hence, when the means of subsistence are plentiful and numbers small, group-conflict is light and insignificant, but when many are striving for a limited supply, collision is harsh and violent. Thus the relative importance of war in a given group varies directly with the intensity of its competition of life.

The classical example of the absence of war is that of the Eskimos. Among the Greenlanders warfare is unknown; this state of affairs is explained by the lack of crowding.¹ The population is small, scattered, and chiefly engaged in winning subsistence in a difficult habitat. The struggle for existence is intense, and the fact that the Eskimos can and do live in such a barren region is one of the most remarkable cases of human adaptation to environment.² "The Greenlanders cannot afford to waste time in wrangling amongst themselves; the struggle to wring from Nature the necessities of life, that great problem of humanity, is there harder than anywhere else, and therefore this little people has agreed to carry it on without needless dissensions."³ Coöperation in the struggle for existence is absolutely imperative in their case. "The Greenlander's first social law is to help his neighbour. Upon it, and upon their habit of clinging together through good and ill, depends the existence of the little Greenland community."⁴ Hence, hospitality is regarded as a duty both here and among the Eskimos about Bering Strait.⁵ It is forced upon them by the condi-

tions of their environment, for they are frequently overtaken by storms when far from home and are compelled to take refuge in the nearest dwelling place. Because of the hardships of life they must place the utmost confidence in one another. Consequently they are characterized by a high degree of integrity. Among themselves they almost never steal or lie. "Good-humour, peaceableness, and evenness of temper are the most prominent features in his character," says Nansen⁶ of the Greenlander. "His peaceableness even goes so far that when anything is stolen from him, which seldom happens, he does not as a rule reclaim it even if he knows who has taken it. . . . The result is that there is seldom or never any quarrelling among them." Fighting and brutality, he says, are unknown, and murder is very rare. "They hold it atrocious to kill a fellow-creature; therefore war is in their eyes incomprehensible and repulsive, a thing for which their language has no word; and soldiers and officers, brought up to the trade of killing, they regard as mere butchers."

A similar situation prevails among the Central Eskimos, of whom Boas⁷ writes, "Real wars or fights between settlements, I believe, have never happened, but contests have always been confined to single families." The Koksoagmyut of the Hudson Bay Territory are likewise "usually peaceful and mild tempered. Among themselves affrays are of rare occurrence."⁸

In Alaska, however, we find a different state of affairs. "The Northern Indians are frequently at war with the Eskimos and Southern Indians, for whom they at all times entertain the most inveterate hatred."⁹ According to Nelson,¹⁰ "previous to the arrival of the Russians on the Alaskan shore of Bering sea the Eskimo waged an almost constant intertribal warfare; at the same time, along the line of contact with the Tinné tribes of the interior, a bitter feud was always in existence." Bancroft¹¹ says of the Hyperboreans that, "notwithstanding their peaceful character, the occupants of the several islands were almost constantly at war." What is the explanation of this difference between the eastern and western Eskimos? In the first place, the struggle for existence is less severe in Alaska, and the population is denser. Consequently group-collision is more frequent and serious than

among the Greenlanders. Moreover, "both Kutchins and Eskimos are very jealous regarding their boundaries"¹²—a condition of affairs impossible among the Greenlanders, who fish rather than hunt.¹³ Furthermore, the Alaskan Eskimos are bounded on the interior by hostile Indian tribes, while their eastern cousins have no neighbors of alien race. These factors go far to explain the divergence.

Though the Greenlanders furnish the classic example, there are other instances of unwarlike tribes. Bancroft¹⁴ says the inland Columbians were not a warlike race. "Resort to arms for the settlement of their intertribal disputes seems to have been very rare. Yet," he adds, "all are brave warriors when fighting becomes necessary for defense or vengeance against a foreign foe." Mrs. Allison,¹⁵ writing in 1891, says, "The Similkameen [Indians of British Columbia] of today are a peace-loving people—indeed, they have too much property to wish for war, and they have frequently said that if trouble arose between the white settlers and any of the kindred tribes they would go to the mountains and abide the event, as they would neither fight the whites nor their own kinsmen."

The Aurohuacos of Colombia are said to have no weapons of offense or defense. "If two quarrel they go out to a big rock or tree and each with his staff beats the rock or tree with vituperations. The one whose staff breaks first is the victor; then they embrace and return home as friends."¹⁶ The settling of a private quarrel like this, however, is an in-group affair; means are devised for a peaceful settlement of such differences so that the group can be united for war with outsiders. The above quotation, therefore, does no more than emphasize the peaceful character of this people in the settlement of their internal quarrels. Their method, to be sure, is less violent than that of the Araucanians, who under such circumstances batter each other unmercifully.¹⁷ Nothing is said of the relation of the Aurohuacos to other groups. Their lack of weapons, however, would argue that they are unused to war. This is possibly a case of cultural degeneration.¹⁸

The Napo Indians of Ecuador are said to possess no arms for warfare. Nevertheless they use the lance and blowgun for hunting, and these weapons may well be used also for war, for in many savage tribes weapons are not as yet differentiated. These Indians are also reported as being "timid towards man" and "inoffensive," though in their past history they were well acquainted with real warfare.¹⁹ Markham²⁰

states, with little further information, that thirty different tribes in the valley of the Amazon River are to be regarded as peaceful.

The Lapps, for somewhat the same reasons as apply in the case of the Greenlanders, are said to be "extremely peaceful, possessing no offensive weapons, carrying on no inter-tribal feuds, kind, good-natured, and, except in Russia, strictly honest and trustworthy."²¹ Among the Canary Islanders, the people of Hierro were exceptional in knowing no war and having no weapons, although their long leaping-poles could be used as such when occasion demanded.²²

In Africa, the people of Fida are said to be "so strongly bent to trade and agriculture, that they never think of war."²³ The Nilotic Kavirondo are a comparatively peaceful, non-aggressive folk, though by no means cowards, for when forced to it they are better fighters than many of their more warlike neighbors.²⁴ The Bahima are also spoken of as a peaceful people. "They seldom make war upon other tribes; their chief object in life is to live quietly with their cattle. Nevertheless they have ever to be on the defensive, for other tribes have always looked upon their vast herds of cattle with jealous eyes."²⁵ Their reason for favoring peace is therefore, like that of the Indians of British Columbia mentioned above, abundant means of livelihood.

Human groups have always had two alternatives as to self-maintenance: to work directly for their means of subsistence, or to rob other groups of the fruits of their toil. The first has been followed especially by agriculturists, and they have frequently been despoiled by the more warlike nomads who have adopted the second. The Makalakas, said to be the best tillers among the natives of South Africa, were very peaceful; they were conquered by the nomadic Zulus. A similar fate has befallen many other agricultural tribes. The Manansas, too, were splendid agriculturists in former times, and peace was their pride. "They hated to fight, and they killed their game in traps or holes in the ground. When the Matabele [who are cattle raisers and very warlike] came into their country the Manansas threw their assegais to the ground and said, 'We do not want to fight, come into our houses.' The Matabele said, 'There is something wrong, they only say this that they may have time to gather more strength;' and that same day they threw the king of the Manansas to ground, tore open his bowels, and put his heart on his lips, saying, 'You are a false man ;

you have two hearts.' At the present time, when the Matabele come into their land, the Manansas run as far as possible to the west and say, 'We are subjects of the Bamangwato,' but when they are pressed by the Bamangwato, they go to the east and say, 'We are subjects of the king of the Matabele.' They do this because they do not care to fight. They are looked upon by the other South African tribes with great disdain, as cowards."²⁶ Livingstone's statement that the policy of peace at any price leads to loss of dignity and to injustice and exposes men to unworthy treatment and injuries seems well borne out in this case. The Manganja of Nyassaland similarly "are a very unwarlike tribe—they themselves say with perfect unconcern that 'every Manganja has the heart of a chicken.' " The effect of their lack of fighting spirit is to be seen in the fact that for fifty years or so before the British pacified the country in 1891–92, they were harried, raided and enslaved by their neighbors. "Their language has become a sort of *lingua franca* all over southern Nyassaland, owing, no doubt, to their having been the slaves of every tribe."²⁷

The Todas of South India are said to be entirely destitute of military organization and are described as peaceable, mild, and friendly.²⁸ Rivers,²⁹ the leading authority on these people, knew of no case of assault by one Toda on another with the exception of incidents accompanying the transfer of wives and never heard of any offense against property except in connection with the dairy, their chief occupation. Moreover, he writes, "I heard of no disputes between members of different clans or different villages about grazing rights." Though at the present time the Todas are unacquainted with war and use no weapons, they nevertheless retain in their ceremonies the club and the bow and arrow—weapons which were, no doubt, formerly used. In the Khasi Hills of India war does not occur but for a totally different reason. The Garos and Khasis in this district are restrained by mutual fear from raiding one another.³⁰

War does not exist among the Veddahs of Ceylon. Van Goens,³¹ writing in the seventeenth century, says, "They live so peacefully together that one seldom hears of quarrels among them and never of war." The Sarasin brothers state [1893] that murder, rob-

bery, infanticide, and cruelty are completely foreign to the Veddahs, who live together without strife and are timid and silent toward strangers. Virchow³² explains their lack of war as due to the fact that they have not yet made the step from hunter to warrior.³³ The Sarasins corroborate this statement.³⁴ The Veddahs are among the most primitive peoples extant; they represent the lowest stage of self-maintenance—collecting with some hunting—and have almost no conception of property. They do not as yet possess well-defined hunting boundaries as a source of disputes leading to war. Nevertheless, strife over property rights is not entirely unknown. While a certain Veddah was gathering fruit from a breadfruit tree, which he regarded as his own, another Veddah from an adjoining district saw him and objected that the tree belonged to him. They wrangled, then came to blows, and finally one shot the other. Thereupon more people gathered and such a lively fight with bows and arrows arose between the two groups that twenty or thirty were killed. Other authors state that the Veddahs will shoot trespassers; the death of a man arouses his clan members and leads to a fight between the clans. This is the only trace of war among these people. According to the Sarasins this germ does not develop into real war, for after a certain number have fallen the affair stops. The result is never conquest but only the fixing of boundaries between hunting grounds.

The Kubus of Sumatra are another peaceably inclined group which is said to dislike aggressive war. They resemble the Veddahs also in being timid toward strangers. Forbes³⁵ says, "They are so timorous and shy that it is a rare circumstance for any one to see them, and of course an extremely rare one for any white man. In fact, I doubt if any white man has ever seen the uninfluenced Kubu save as one sees the hind-quarters of a startled deer. . . . They are so afraid of seeing anyone not of their own race that if suddenly met or come up with in the forest, they will drop everything and flee away." These are certainly not bellicose characteristics. Forbes, in fact, was struck by "their extreme submissiveness, their want of independence and will; they seemed too meek ever to act on the offensive." The inhabitants of Timorlaut in

Indonesia, like the Kubus, are meek and opposed to war, yet "they have bravery of a kind, having little fear of death whether occurring in battle or in the course of nature. They generally fight from behind trees and a large number of their bucklers are made to protect them *a tergo*! When wounded, they at once retreat. They are not bloodthirsty when not excited to the height of passion." In perfect agreement with their cowardly character, they become demons when an enemy falls into their hands; they "execute the most horrible cruelty on their still living victim, before affixing his quarters on their public places."⁸⁶

New Guinea reveals a situation somewhat similar to that in the Canary Islands. While all the tribes around them are in a state of continual warfare, the inhabitants of Humboldt Bay enjoy a peaceful existence. The reasons are that firearms have not yet found entrance among them, that kidnapping and slavery do not exist as in other parts of New Guinea, and that they are neither head-hunters nor cannibals.⁸⁷ The Papuan Arafuras are said to live "in peace and brotherly love with one another," but no further information is given about them.⁸⁸ The inhabitants of Sungei Ujong "possess no idea of warfare or racial strife, and freely admit their preference for a life of seclusion and peace."⁸⁹

The native Australians are far from being a warlike race in spite of their frequent affrays. These arise chiefly over women and are settled bloodlessly. The Kulin would often allow Buckley to go among them before a battle and take away their spears, waddies, and boomerangs.⁴⁰ The natives of Victoria are reported as being by no means treacherous and bloodthirsty.⁴¹ Real war does not exist among the Australians because "they have no property that is worth pillaging; no tribe has anything to tempt the cupidity of another. They have no political organization, so there can be no war for power."⁴²

The Moriori of the Chatham Islands were a very unwarlike people. "They quarrelled at times among themselves, but their disputes were mostly conducted with the brawling tongue, and all weapons were forbidden to be used in such quarrels with the exception of the quarterstaff. A broken head was generally the worst wound received, and however slight the injury, if the person hurt

remarked, 'My head is broken,' that ended the fray. They had traditional knowledge of more serious fighting, and possessed, as burial relics, stone clubs, wooden spears, stone axes, etc."⁴³ Their chief occupation was fishing, which, like agriculture, is conducive to a sedentary and peaceful life.

Letourneau⁴⁴ regards the yellow race as the least warlike. The Tibetans have no army; they rely on the moral influence of their terrestrial god, the Dalai Lama, to defend their territory. Their reliance is not absolute, however, for in case of an attack or revolt they raise a militia well armed with offensive and defensive weapons.⁴⁵ China, so Letourneau⁴⁶ thinks, "is certainly the only country in the world in which military glory is scoffed at, and in which the profession of arms is held in small honour;" yet her history is by no means a peaceful one, and religious wars have been especially frequent and bloody there.⁴⁷ The inhabitants of the Liukiu Archipelago seem to be wanting in every warlike sentiment. "They have no arms, either offensive or defensive. They declared to the traveller Hall that they did not know what war was like, either by experience or by tradition, and that it was with the greatest astonishment that they looked at the kriss used by the Malays."⁴⁸

The cases where war is unknown or unimportant have been considered in some detail for the reason that they are quite exceptional. There are other instances where war occurs but results in such slight damage that it can hardly be called by that term. Here the element of force is relatively dormant. The mildness of war in these cases and the slight loss of life are due to the absence of sieges and of organization of supplies, the small number of warriors in the contending tribes, their meager and relatively ineffective weapons, and their mode of fighting. Armed with no weapons superior to the club, spear, bow and arrow, and the like, the warriors necessarily fight at close quarters. In such warfare the object is to ambush and surprise, to kill a few people, and then retreat. If it comes to an open fight, champions are frequently selected to decide the issue by single combat. In any case the destructiveness of their weapons is very limited. This is, however, a relative matter, for the loss of but a few men may be as serious a

blow to a very small group as the slaughter of a large number to a densely populated nation. About fifty cases showing a slight loss of life in primitive warfare are set forth in Appendix C.

We have now reviewed a number of instances where war is unknown or is very mild. It must not be thought, however, that Montesquieu⁴⁹ was correct in his notion that peace was the first law of nature. The facts of ethnography seem rather to bear out the contention of Hobbes⁵⁰ that the original state of mankind was one of war. The instances cited above are exceptional rather than typical. They are to be explained on the grounds that the competition of life is either lacking or else very slight. The tribes they represent are among the most isolated and hence have few or no competitors. But only rarely is isolation complete enough to exclude all group-competition. Pressure of population is seldom absent, and the means of subsistence are naturally limited; hence the competition of life is normally severe. War is practically the only method primitive man knows for the settlement of disputes arising from intergroup competition. In time, as we shall see, means less violent than war are evolved. Nevertheless, a survey of the primitive tribes existing today shows that those living in a continual state of war greatly outnumber those that are predominantly peaceful. Some of the overwhelming evidence on this point is presented below; more is assembled in Appendices D, E, and F.

Incessant warfare was the rule among the Eskimos and Indians of Alaska and the islands of the far northwest.⁵¹ The same was true of the Micmac Indians and the Beothucs of Newfoundland, between whom "there reigns so mortal an enmity that they never meet but a bloody conflict ensues."⁵² The tribes of Sitka Island are reported to be "perpetually in a state of warfare,"⁵³ while peace was the exception among the Salish tribes of British Columbia.⁵⁴

The organization and distribution of the Indians of the United States resulted in a continual state of war. Each tribe was practically at war with every other tribe with which it did not have an express treaty of peace. A state of preparedness always existed, even when war was not actually in operation, and defensive works were often erected. War was intensified by the acquisition of firearms and the horse, and by the crowding back of tribe against tribe by the whites.⁵⁵

Among the natives of Mexico general hostility prevailed. Of the wild

tribes of the valley of Mexico, Bancroft⁵⁶ says, "Warfare was the normal state of these people;" when the Spaniards first arrived at Tabasco in southern Mexico, "they encountered a people well-skilled in the art of war, with a fair knowledge of military tactics, who defended their country with much bravery; their towns and villages were well fortified with intrenchments or palisades, and strong towers and forts were built on such places as presented the most favorable position for resisting attacks." Among the more civilized Nahua nations the art of war was almost as highly developed as in Europe. They are said to have had a standing army, fortifications, military orders, a military council, articles of war, etc. They waged incessant war and by its means built up a powerful kingdom.⁵⁷ Very similar was the military organization of the ancient Peruvians, who had a large standing army led by the Inca nobility, compulsory military service for the common people, and all the accoutrements of a modern army with the exception of firearms. The Incas, engaged upon a career of conquest, waged incessant warfare.⁵⁸ Among the wild tribes of Central America, "battles were frequent and sanguinary," while the brave and warlike natives of the West Indies greatly harassed the Spaniards before they were conquered.⁵⁹

If the Mongolian race is the most peaceful, the Negro is certainly the most warlike and the most accustomed to bloodshed, not only in battle, but also in everyday life. Callousness to human suffering is characteristic of the African. Of the Makololo, for instance, Livingstone⁶⁰ once remarked: "It is hard to make them feel that shedding of human blood is a great crime; they must be conscious that it is wrong, but, having been accustomed to bloodshed from infancy, they are remarkably callous to the enormity of the crime of destroying human life." As a matter of fact, the savage does not think it "wrong," for his indifference to bloodshed is due very largely to his religion.⁶¹ According to Ellis,⁶² "the constant spectacle of human sacrifice has in Dahomi, as in Ashanti, produced a general callousness to human suffering, and a want of human sympathy that is most revolting." "A constant familiarity with the scenes of slaughter that are presented at funerals, and when human victims are sacrificed to the gods, has produced among the northern Tshi-speaking tribes a want of sympathy and a callousness to human suffering which is perhaps

unparalleled. . . . The most revolting scenes of cruelty and bloodshed are regarded by the populace generally with positive pleasure, and no sooner is the death-drum heard, than an excited mob, eager for the spectacle, rushes to the spot, and embitters the last moments of the victims with taunts and jeers. The executioners, to pander to the tastes of the mob, or to gratify their own lust for cruelty, practise the most shocking barbarities, blunting their knives to increase the sufferings of their victims, or cutting pieces of flesh from the neck before striking off the head. In fact, the most refined tortures that human ingenuity can devise are constantly inflicted, death is ever present, and human suffering and human life are alike disregarded." Those sacrificed to the gods are generally prisoners of war, and wars are frequently undertaken solely to procure such victims.

Fighting is so much to the liking of the African that many tribes have been eager to enter the service of Europeans. Thus the Nilotic Kavirondo, the Swahili, the Ajawu, and many Nyassaland tribes—the Ayao, Atonga, and Angoni, to mention but a few—have proved good material for native troops under British officers.⁶³ African troops rendered valuable assistance to the Allied Powers in the World War. Ratzel⁶⁴ thinks the African is a natural soldier. "In the service of white men," he says, "the negro shows valuable military qualities, in the United States, in Algeria, in Egypt, in German East Africa, in British West Africa. With great bodily strength and capacity for enduring fatigue, he is teachable, knows how to obey; and also to appreciate that he is a soldier. He loves his gay uniform and his weapons."

Examples of warlike tribes in Africa, of kingdoms established by conquest, of whole districts scourged, of the annihilation, enslavement, or forced migration of the vanquished, are so numerous that they have been placed in an appendix. The whole history of Africa might be written with war as its keynote. One tribe, however, deserves special mention, since it furnishes the prototype of the historical custom of employing mercenary soldiers. The Pygmies, especially those of the Belgian Congo, are professional fighters. "Owning no territory they settled on the land of a chief (usually of the Mabode tribe), a tacit bargain being usual that

they shall remain there unmolested on condition that they give their military assistance to him when he may be engaged in warfare." They are generally held in fear and respect because of their skill and prowess in war and because they are known never to forget an injury until it is avenged to the utmost. Their assistance is also valuable in the event of an intertribal quarrel. "As all the people are in a perpetual state of internecine warfare, the aid of the pygmies is no small factor in the army of the chief under whom they live, nor are they a negligible factor in his domestic diplomacy. A native chief is very fond of getting hold of a child of the pygmies—a boy—to train it up as one of his own body-guard. By this means the chief is enabled to find out the state of mind of his little neighbours, for the boy may come and go among his tribe with a freedom denied to other natives. In this manner the chief is able to anticipate the wants of his allies or to receive news of their intended actions, which it is often very necessary for him to know."⁶⁵

In parts of India we find the same state of incessant warfare that characterizes so much of Africa. Many of the Indian natives have also been eager to enter the English service, being, like the Angami, "soldiers both by nature and taste."⁶⁶ The Nagas of Northeast India are subdivided into innumerable independent tribes, constantly at war with one another.⁶⁷ They are described as "fierce and intractable, living in a state of incessant intertribal warfare," and carrying on relentless raiding. The tribe is divided into *khels* or kin-groups, and *khels* living side by side in the same village were often so hostile that no effort would be made by one to check the massacre, within the village walls, of another.⁶⁸ Moreover, "there are often bitter inter-*khel* feuds and consequent bloody contests between the inhabitants of the same village, one *khel* against the other, albeit bound together by ties of marriage and kinship. To show to what extent this independence of the different *khels* exists an incident is given in the Assam Census Report for 1891, where a Naga gives a jocular description of an attack on his village, in the course of which one man, five women and twenty children were slaughtered in one of the *khels*, while those of an adjoining *khel* stood by and never lent a hand to their neighbours. The narrator declared that he never saw such rare sport as the killing of the children; it was, he added, just like killing chickens."⁶⁹

The condition of some of these tribes is revealed by the fact that

"the Angami villages were practically strongly posted hill stockades; and that in the villages of North Kachar, during the night a watch was kept, and the streets were regularly patrolled; and that among the eastern Nagas in 1873 every village was constantly prepared against surprise, parties of men keeping continual watch and ward over the village gate-ways."⁷⁰ Colonel Woodthorpe⁷¹ found the Angami villages all built on commanding positions, and, owing to the almost constant state of war, mostly strongly fortified. In like manner, the Nagas of Eastern Assam established their villages on the crests of hills, where an extended view of the surrounding country could be obtained, and where sudden attacks were rendered almost impossible by the acclivity of the approaches.⁷²

Largely because of the continual warfare there grew up in these districts an institution known as the "morong" or young men's barracks. These are essentially guardhouses, though they are also used as trophy houses, guest houses, council houses, etc. Here sleep all the unmarried men and, in the case of the Murrans of Manipur, the younger married men as well. Arms are always kept in a state of readiness. In Eastern Assam, guards are maintained at the morongs day and night to keep tally of the men who leave and return. These guardhouses are invariably situated at the principal entrances to the villages. In front, a raised platform, used as a lookout, commands an extensive view of all approaches. Each morong possesses a large hollow tree used as a drum to sound the alarm when an enemy draws near. Skulls acquired in battle generally adorn the walls. Morongs are found among the Nagas and other frontier tribes of Northeast India, in Manipur and Eastern Assam, and elsewhere.⁷³

Among the Yusufzai of Northern India, raids are so much a part of national existence that "every village owns its warning drum, which assembles the men together for village defence the instant that scouts bring in warning of attack; and it is astonishing how soon the whole countryside can be called to arms by this means."⁷⁴ The dominant rôle of war in the lives both of the inhabitants of Oceania and of ancient civilized peoples is presented in Appendix D.

Warfare among primitive peoples, moreover, is not always so mild and bloodless as the instances first cited might lead one to believe. For the few cases where war causes but slight damage, there are many where it is violent and destructive. While we cannot accept without qualification Robinson's⁷⁵ statement that "in savage warfare the defeated party is seldom left with any surplus

population," it is, nevertheless, a fact that war has retarded the growth of population among primitive peoples and has entailed relatively large loss of life, besides forcing whole tribes to migrate or to exchange their independence for slavery. The evidence, fully presented in Appendix F, shows that thousands of persons have been slain in single battles among the African natives, that in America and elsewhere entire tribes have been exterminated, and that in certain South Sea Islands accumulated heaps of skull-trophies clutter the beaches.

The ancient civilized peoples conducted wars on a larger scale and made effective conquests.⁷⁶ In Egypt the effects of invasion and conquest are to be seen in the different racial types represented in paintings and sculptures.⁷⁷ Both Assyrians and Egyptians often waged against their less civilized neighbors wars leading to the "extermination of the uncivilized race, or at least of the whole adult male population, and the absorption of the women and children by the conquering race, so as practically to extinguish the conquered tribe. . . . But this result did not invariably follow. It appears to have been a usual policy of the Chaldeans, Assyrians, and Babylonians, as well as the Medes and Persians, to transplant whole colonies of one conquered race and settle them in the territory of another subject people. The main purpose of the transfer was apparently simply to break up national ties and to fuse the whole population of the empire into one submissive whole."⁷⁸ The ancient Arabs waged war with savage relentlessness; prisoners of war were eaten or sold into slavery.⁷⁹ The Jews of the Old Testament, by the order of their God, carried on wars of extermination against their enemies. Their accounts reek with blood and slaughter; even women and children were slain.⁸⁰ Among later barbaric peoples may be mentioned the Mongols under Genghis Khan and Tamerlane with their pyramids of skulls⁸¹ and the Kurds of the Ottoman Empire with their incessant bloody strife.⁸² The perpetual warfare of the Morocco Berbers involves heavy casualties.⁸³ The Bedouins, despite the usually small loss of life in their "blood" wars and marauding expeditions, know what "slaughter" really means, for "it frequently happens, and espe-

cially among the mountain Arabs, that one tribe puts to death all the males of their enemies whom they can possibly seize."⁸⁴

Has the introduction of modern weapons made warfare among primitive peoples more deadly? Ratzel⁸⁵ believes that "firearms have diminished war, while increasing the losses" among savage races. The facts do not support this contention. The first effect of the introduction of firearms is to change the style of fighting. Thus the Maori, before they had firearms, fought hand-to-hand; now they fight at a distance.⁸⁶ Other Polynesians, after they received firearms, took to "fighting at a distance and promiscuous shooting from ambushes all day long" and developed the art of taking cover more rapidly than that of attacking.⁸⁷ Among the American Indians, the entire mode of fighting, as well as of living, was changed by the acquisition of the horse and the rifle, both of which were adapted to their needs and used with consummate skill.⁸⁸ As a rule, firearms also drive out the native weapons, as among the hill tribes of North Aracan,⁸⁹ the Fang,⁹⁰ and the inhabitants of the island of Malekula.⁹¹ In the latter case, however, clubs and tomahawks have been an exception, for they are still favored as being certain and noiseless.

The acquisition of firearms has had different results in different cases. It has made the Bechuanas more warlike, while it has increased war among the Makanga.⁹² In other cases it has made war more severe, giving an advantage to the tribe first obtaining the white man's weapons. It was thus that the Blackfeet nearly exterminated the Flatheads.⁹³ Only in a few cases, however, have the natives learned to use firearms in an effective way. The American Indians are the outstanding example among less civilized races; among the more civilized, the Berbers of Morocco, who are well supplied with Remington rifles and ammunition by smugglers from Spain and Gibraltar, and are expert in using them. This is especially true of the Riffi tribesmen of Tangier, who now act as guards over houses and other property, and "woe betide the robber at whom is levelled a Riffi firearm."⁹⁴ Primitive peoples in general, however, do not understand firearms at first, and many never learn to use them correctly. The natives of the Canary Islands, on discovering the destructive power of European

weapons, "considered that wounds were deadly in proportion to the noise of the discharge producing them, and therefore in battle imitated with the mouth the sounds made by the crossbows and harquebuses of the Spaniards."⁹⁵ The Tasmanians never understood the rifle; they believed that when a European had fired it, he became disarmed.⁹⁶ The Fijians likewise could not comprehend firearms, and at the siege of Verata they held up mats to ward off the bullets.

The introduction of firearms diminished war in Fiji, because they first made possible the establishment of large confederations. Moreover, it did not increase the mortality, since the muskets obtained by the natives were very inferior. "The trade muskets which were imported in the early days by the traders in enormous quantities were flintlocks and 'tower' muskets, and when fretted by rust were often more dangerous to the man at the stock than to the man at the muzzle. The native marksmanship, always erratic, was not improved by a custom common in Vatulale and other parts of the group, of sawing off the greater part of the stock, and firing with the barrel poised in the left hand at arm's length."⁹⁷ The Solomon Islanders possessed firearms, but Elton⁹⁸ heard of but few cases where men died from gunshot wounds. "Although the natives," he writes, "are very fair marksmen when cool and collected, yet in a surprise they fire off their guns without taking aim. Some time ago a native had a shot at me not ten paces off, with intent to kill, but missed." Gillan⁹⁹ recounts a fight which took place at Port Stanley in the New Hebrides shortly after his arrival. Fifty men from one of the islands were engaged with over two hundred from a neighboring island and rifles were used by both sides. By the time he arrived on the scene, which was some minutes later, all the powder had been expended and the fighting, in consequence, had come to a standstill. But instead of finding heaps of wounded mutilated in savage fashion by the victors, or corpses being dragged off to be eaten, as he fully expected, he was astonished to discover that no one on either side had been so much as grazed by a bullet, although the firing had been at a range of not over thirty yards. "Peace was accordingly happily arranged, and the affair closed to the huge relief of both parties."

The Chins of India make their own powder, having learned the process probably from the Chinese through the Burmans. Their guns, however, are rather ineffective, owing to the inferiority of their bullets. "Lead of course is the favourite metal, but it is fortunately scarce and the Chin has had to turn to brass, bell-metal, iron, round stones, and even to clay pellets." They have also been known to use pieces of telegraph wire.¹⁰⁰ Though the hill tribes of Burma own muskets, they are not more dangerous adversaries than before, for "the powder is home-made, and not very strong."¹⁰¹ The possession of firearms has made the loss of life less than before among the Maoris of New Zealand, for they now fight from a distance.¹⁰² The Bangala of West Africa is a much less effective fighter with the weapons of the white man than with his own. "When fighting with a gun he is timid, nervous, and apparently very cowardly, because he does not understand the mysteries of gunpowder, but give him a shield and a spear and his bravery is evidenced by his boldness in a fight and his utter indifference to wounds and death."¹⁰³

The possession of guns and ammunition has altered the mode of fighting and introduced new customs of warfare among the Bakongo. Weeks¹⁰⁴ writes: "Sometimes the towns fighting will exhaust their stock of gunpowder before either side has gained any advantage over the other. A truce is then made for two or three months while they lay in another supply, and on the appointed day they will start firing again at each other. I have known this to happen more than once, and in those localities gunpowder has advanced in price. At other times they have agreed to postpone the commencement of a fight until each side has a good supply of powder, and this also has sent up the price of powder throughout the district." Their guns are ridiculously ineffective; hence the mortality of war has been greatly diminished among them. They like the new weapons, however, for they make a lot of noise. Their earlier weapons were bows and arrows, axes, spears, and swords, but these have been entirely superseded by "paltry, cheap, flintlock guns, introduced by traders, the barrels of which in most cases, have been fashioned out of old gas-piping, and frequently do more damage to the person firing them than to the one at whom they are fired. The stock and fixings are in keeping with the barrel. The powder used is generally adulterated, and is warranted to make more noise and smoke than do damage—such powder has little carrying power, and less penetrating force. The bullets are bits of twisted brass wire, broken iron ore, stones, or pieces of metal broken small enough to go down the barrel." When the gun is loaded for firing, "the fighter

does not press the butt into his right shoulder and look along the barrel as he takes aim; but he holds the butt of the gun against the palm of his half-extended right hand, and, without taking aim, he pulls the trigger with a finger of his left hand. By this mode of firing he guards his eyes from the sparks of the powder as it flashes in the pan, and his head from being blown off should the barrel burst from the excessive charge of powder forced into the barrel; but the aim being unsteady and uncertain, the object fired at is more secure than the objects in its immediate vicinity. The Congo gun will not carry more than about fifty yards, but the combatants, when firing, stand about a hundred yards from each other, and the result generally is an almost bloodless war. I have known over two hundred men fight thirty-two, and after these unequal sides had fired at each other for two and a half days, one man was struck on the ankle by a spent plug, which penetrated the flesh so slightly that I was able to remove it with my pen-knife." This recalls the account of a French duel which Mark Twain records in *A Tramp Abroad*.

Primitive tribes in general—to sum up the foregoing discussion—are more warlike than peaceful, and their warfare is severe and sanguinary more often than it is mild and bloodless. Nomadic races are as a rule more belligerent than agriculturists, and are more often engaged in war; their constant wanderings in search of water and fresh grazing or hunting grounds lead to incessant conflicts with other tribes. As a corollary to this, mountain tribes are almost universally more warlike than those of the plains and valleys. The latter are generally agriculturists, since their land is more fertile, while the environment of the former is more suited to hunting and cattle raising. The conflict of herders and tillers, with the former dominating the latter, is a common phenomenon in culture history. Agricultural civilization, however, does not necessarily conduce to peace. On the contrary, with the growth of population and political control, war becomes more widespread and destructive.¹⁰⁵ Thus the Aztecs of Mexico, the Incas of Peru, the African kingdoms of Dahomey and Benin, and the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia all stand out as more militaristic than the less civilized tribes about them. Encounters were on a larger scale, and effective conquest now for the first time became feasible.

Primitive warfare is costly in human life and destructive of property. Records tell of whole tribes wiped out of existence. How many other groups met a similar fate before the Discoveries Period brought savage tribes into history, we shall never fully know, but they must have been innumerable. A principle of savage warfare is to kill all the men or as many as possible and to abduct the women and children. Many tribes take no prisoners of war, or, if they do, immediately kill them. The earliest mitigation of war was the sparing of women and children. Facts set forth below, under head-hunting, blood revenge, cannibalism, and human sacrifice, will further attest the general severity and destructiveness of primitive warfare.

CHAPTER V

CANNIBALISM AND WAR

WHAT are the basic motives which lead men to fight? All wars are, of course, either offensive or defensive in origin as well as in mode of conduct. Any group may wage war to defend itself; aggression is nearly always met by resistance. An inquiry into the impelling causes of war, however, is chiefly concerned with the motives which lead to aggression. A tribe on the defensive may have given another sufficient cause to attack, or the latter may have encroached on the former to gain plunder, more land, or the like. Hence the statement that a tribe is on the defensive or offensive conveys very little information *per se* as to the causes of the war. The reason for the conflict is to be sought elsewhere. Similarly, retaliation or reprisal may lead to war, but the real cause is the occasion of the offense which is now to be avenged. It is said that anyone will fight when he is mad enough. This may explain the outbreak of hostilities, but it does not explain the motive, the reasons why one is angry enough to fight. Pretexts, also, are to be distinguished from real motives; they tell no more than that the pretender wants war. Thus in Rotuma if the chief of one district wanted to fight and no cause was at hand, he would steal a woman from another district, and then, without waiting for the latter to demand her return, would declare war himself.¹ Woman stealing was evidently not the cause of war in this case.

War has been waged for many different reasons, yet all the impelling causes naturally group themselves into a few general categories. They may be classified under four major headings: war for economic motives, for women, for glory, and for religious reasons. Expressed in their lowest terms, the motives are hunger, love, vanity, and ghost-fear.² All the mores may be grouped under these headings; and war, whose influence permeates the entire social structure, is in turn affected by every other social interest.

Since society is an organic whole, however, these four general causes of war can be separated only on paper; in actual life they are intricately intertwined. Thus in head-hunting, though the religious motive predominates, the others are also present; a man is not considered worthy of the name until he has taken a head, nor may he marry until he has done so, while plundering is a factor in nearly every expedition.

¹Religion has promoted war by demanding human sacrifices, prompting head-hunting, and insisting upon blood revenge. The factor of vanity appears in the desire for trophies, in the distinctions accorded the warrior, and in war for glory. A strong motive is the acquisition of women—as slaves or as wives. But the most fundamental cause of war is hunger or the economic motive, and it ties war up straightway with the competition of life. Groups come directly into conflict in carrying on their struggle for existence; they fight over hunting and grazing grounds, for food, for watering places, for plunder.

The most elemental economic motive is the quest for food. On the lowest stages of societal evolution men themselves are regarded as part of the food supply. Human flesh is animal meat, and cannibalism in such cases is part of the group's self-maintenance. At one time cannibalism was practiced extensively, if we may judge from the large number of anthropophagous tribes known to ethnography and from the survivals found among other races. Evidence from primitive peoples shows that cannibalism, especially when practiced on members of the out-group, is commonly prompted either by actual want or by a liking for human flesh.³

The history of mankind abounds with wars for the purpose of making the enemy serve as a means of satisfying one's own needs. On the lowest stage of social organization, the only way in which one horde can utilize the members of another is to kill and eat them.⁴ It cannot enslave them, for it is not sufficiently organized to hold slaves, and there is no special work for them to do. Nieboer⁵ has shown by many instances that slavery in any appreciable amount or degree does not occur until the agricultural stage is reached. Tribes which gain their livelihood by hunting or cattle raising have no real need for slaves. Some fishing peoples, how-

ever, are known to keep slaves, since the sedentary nature of their occupation makes it possible both to use and guard them. Where slavery does not exist, if the life of a captured enemy is spared, he is usually adopted into the conqueror's tribe. There are a few instances of adoption, but in the majority of cases the enemy is killed, either in battle or after capture. In either case he may be eaten. Prisoners are utilized as food, not as producers of food. Thus cannibalism becomes an incentive to war.

The hunting of men is very similar to the hunting of animals. Such warfare is "merely an intensified counterpart of the chase."⁶ The weapons are the same and the tactics similar. Among the natives of Nigeria, "a chase may easily be turned into a battle, even amongst the hunters themselves, when the arms for both are the same, and the search for beasts may become a hunt for men."⁷ Among the cannibalistic Carapaches of South America, "when one of them is pursuing the chase in the woods, and hearing another hunter imitating the cry of an animal, he immediately makes the same cry to entice him nearer, and if he is of another tribe he kills him if he can and (as is alleged) eats him."⁸ Frobenius⁹ has collected many cases of such elementary warfare which he calls man hunts, so closely do they resemble animal hunts.

Cannibalism as a cause of war is most frequently found in Melanesia. Of the New Caledonians it is said that "the desire to eat human flesh was the cause of frequent wars among the different tribes. The chiefs sometimes said to their people: 'It is a long while since we have eaten any meat; go out and get some.' The struggle was over when the desired object had been effected, as soon as a few men had been killed."¹⁰ Human flesh they considered a delicacy, they ate it because they liked it, and the craving for it was undoubtedly often the cause of war.¹¹ One tribe in Fisher Island "lived by fighting for any party who might hire them, the only payment sought being the bodies of the slain."¹² Von Pfeil,¹³ writing in 1899, said that cannibalism in the Bismarck Archipelago was so rampant in its aggressive form that no Kanaka might venture outside of his district without fear of being killed and eaten. The cannibals of New Georgia "frequently went on raids into the adjoining bush to satisfy this appetite."¹⁴ The

Fijians were greatly addicted to exophagy, and "raids were undertaken solely to procure human flesh."¹⁵ The desire for such food was often the main cause of wars between villages.¹⁶

In the Marquesas Islands, where practically all the tribes were man-eaters, many minor wars and skirmishes were prompted by the same appetite.¹⁷ Letourneau¹⁸ mentions cannibalism as a cause of war in New Zealand; tribes "would go hundreds of miles into the interior to fight, merely that they might feed themselves upon human flesh or to capture slaves, generally intended to appear as the *plat de résistance* at the great feasts which they prepared for their parents or their friends, either immediately before setting out upon a campaign, or else upon some occasion of unusual rejoicing. The New Zealanders were very partial to the flesh of women and of children."

Certain anthropophagous tribes of Australia, according to Taplin,¹⁹ go man hunting, placing themselves in ambuscade and devouring members of other tribes when they succeed in surprising them. The Narrinyeri hate the Merkani because the latter have a propensity for stealing fat people and eating them. If a man has a stout wife, he is particularly careful not to leave her unprotected, lest she be seized by the prowling Merkani.²⁰

The Ba-Huana of Africa have a "sincere liking for human flesh. . . . The bodies of enemies are consumed, and expeditions are arranged for the purpose of recruiting the larder."²¹ The Fang will waylay members of other tribes to kill and eat them.²² The Monbuttu of the Upper Nile are inveterate cannibals; they eat little meat except the bodies of their captives. "They are in a state of perpetual warfare with the inferior tribes around them, in order to procure for themselves human flesh. They cut up the dead on the field of battle, and drive home before them as a flock of sheep the prisoners whom they intend to reserve for future meals."²³

The Aztecs of Mexico waged war chiefly to gather victims for their religious sacrifices, but the slain captives were afterward eaten at the religious feasts, and Payne²⁴ holds that war was waged for this purpose as much as for the former. In South America, the aboriginal races of the northwestern provinces "were

constantly at war one with another, and these wars appear to have been made less with the idea of rectifying their frontiers than with that of replenishing their larders, for they were almost all cannibals."²⁵ Similarly the Arekainas of the Rio Negro "make war against other tribes to obtain prisoners for food,"²⁶ and the roving Macus of Brazil attack the settled Indians to kill and eat them.²⁷

Cannibalism is also a result of war. The slain may be eaten after a battle caused by other reasons than the desire for human flesh, and prisoners may meet the same fate. The fallen and captured are eaten lest good meat go to waste; man himself is the booty of war on an early stage.

Krieger²⁸ states that the natives of New Guinea cooked and ate their slain enemies. In the Papuan Archipelago, wherever prisoners of war were not yet kept as slaves, they were eaten by the victors.²⁹ The Fijians were notorious for the same practice. They often carved up the bodies of the slain and roasted them on the field of battle. Sometimes they did not even take the trouble to kill the victim before cooking him; Macdonald³⁰ saw a prisoner thrown alive into a large boiler. Captives were also taken to be eaten later, occasionally after fattening. When the natives of Ugi, Solomon Islands, were engaged in war with neighboring villages or tribes, they "always feasted on any unlucky enemy they captured or killed."³¹ When not sufficiently supplied with prisoners of war—they were "exceedingly cowardly and timid fighters"—they bought human victims for their feasts. These were mostly women, who were "regularly fattened in their purchasers' villages till the festive time. Then they were deliberately killed and eaten, just as fattened pigs would be."³² Throughout the Solomon Islands, prisoners of war were sold for food.³³

In northern Queensland, the enemies killed in battle were not eaten, but the slain tribal members were readily devoured.³⁴ The Luritcha tribe, however, ate its fallen foes, as did many other Australian tribes.³⁵ Only rarely, however, did the Australian eat his dead enemies for the sake of food.³⁶ The Maori, by contrast, prepared large numbers of human bodies to provide a whole tribe and its friends with a feast. Every enemy slain in battle served the victors as food. The craving for meat and the scarcity of foodstuffs in siege-time were among the reasons for this practice.³⁷ Others will appear later. Sometimes the Maoris would tear a captured or wounded enemy to pieces on the field of battle, not even waiting till he was dead or taking the trouble to kill him.³⁸

Their anthropophagous feasts frequently lasted several days after a battle and became the themes of many of their songs.⁸⁹ In 1826, according to official figures, the army of Hougi ate 800 persons. In 1828, in the war of Rotorua, the bodies of sixty warriors killed in combat were cooked and eaten in two days. Tregear⁴⁰ mentions cases where 150 and even 250 prisoners of war were eaten at one time. Other Polynesian tribes devoured their dead enemies.⁴¹ The Ainu of Japan occasionally ate prisoners taken in the night raids on one another's villages.⁴²

The African Monbuttu "cure for future use the bodies of the slain in battle, and drive their prisoners before them, as butchers drive sheep to the shambles, and these are only reserved to fall victims on a later day to their horrible and sickly greediness."⁴³ The Niam-Niam of the Upper Nile likewise kill and eat their prisoners of war.⁴⁴ The Ba-Zimba rivaled the Maoris in the scale of their cannibalism, as was illustrated in their siege of the Portuguese-Arab town of Kilwa. "This they finally took and sacked, and ate thousands of their prisoners."⁴⁵ The Bageshu eat not only their prisoners of war but also their own dead, so that their country has been called a land without graves.⁴⁶ The Ba-Mbala, who eat "everything that liveth and moveth, from man down to grasshoppers and ants," regard human flesh as a special delicacy, and eat all enemies slain in war, and frequently foreign slaves as well. The Ba-Huana similarly are cannibals from deliberate choice; they relish human flesh. "Any man falling into their hands is killed and eaten." The bodies of all enemies are consumed, the flesh being prepared and boiled like any other meat.⁴⁷

Cannibalism is widely practiced in the Congo region, especially among the warlike tribes, who eat both captives and slaves.⁴⁸ The tribes of the Upper Congo, besides eating prisoners of war, conduct an organized traffic in human flesh, "men, women, and children being continually purchased and sold expressly for cannibal purposes."⁴⁹ The Boloki "ate human flesh for the pleasure of it," regarding it as a great delicacy. Even dead bodies floating down the river were drawn to land and devoured. "When fighting they would not eat one killed on their own side, but if they captured the body of an enemy they would eat it with gusto." The Bangala eat human flesh because, as they say, "it is very nice and better than any other meat." They regard cannibalism with no more concern than they do the eating of a goat. It is customary to eat those slain in battle and also to buy slaves for the same purpose.⁵⁰ The laws of the Mabode forbid them to eat relatives killed in battle, so they cut up and cook the corpses, selling the meat thus prepared to others.⁵¹

An immense tract of land in West Africa, including French Congo and a portion of Cameroon, is occupied by anthropophagous tribes, of whom the outstanding example is the Fans or Fang. Miss Kingsley,⁵² in her characteristic way, says of the Fang: "He has no slaves, no prisoners of war, no cemeteries, so you must draw your own conclusions." Bennett⁵³ cites the craving for animal food as the reason for cannibalism here. "The victims are generally males captured either in war, or members of other tribes waylaid and killed while journeying in the bush." Since Europeans have penetrated the country, cannibalism has been abjured by the natives, but in their unaffected state they ate human flesh without the slightest compunction, regarding it simply as animal food. The Urkus of West Africa are noted for their cannibalism. They eat the prisoners taken in wars with neighboring tribes. If they take more captives than are needed for immediate consumption, they are said to fatten them up for future use.⁵⁴

In America, cannibalism for food was relatively rare north of Mexico. Strange⁵⁵ states that the natives about Nootka Sound cut up and peddled for sale the bodies of enemies slain in battle. He was himself approached by a native warrior with a basketful of such wares. When he discredited the assertion that they were good to eat, the warrior bit off a piece of the flesh and devoured it "with much apparent relish."

South America is a classic seat of anthropophagy. The Caribs killed and ate their prisoners of war.⁵⁶ The Guaguas dried human flesh to preserve it.⁵⁷ Most of the native tribes of Brazil made a regular practice of cannibalism. The Botocudos not only ate slain enemies, but also raided neighboring tribes for similar booty.⁵⁸ The Miranhas regarded human flesh as a "rare, dainty meal."⁵⁹ At the time of the Spanish invasion the Araucanians were still cannibals. The capture of prisoners was made the occasion for a national feast. The captives were tortured, hacked to pieces, and eaten—sometimes roasted but often raw.⁶⁰ Among the Fuegians, after an engagement, "those who are vanquished and taken, if not already dead, are killed and eaten by their conquerors."⁶¹

Among more civilized peoples, the early Arabs were anthropophagous and ate the bodies of their enemies.⁶² The Homeric Greeks had advanced beyond this stage, but some of their less civilized neighbors had not.⁶³ The Arab travelers of the seventh century charged the Chinese with eating all enemies killed in war.⁶⁴ Instances of cannibalism among more or less cultured peoples are, however, more often survivalistic.

But cannibalism is by no means always prompted by the desire for food. It is often practiced out of hatred and revenge. How do these sentiments lead to the eating of the body or part of the body of an enemy? It is held almost universally by uncivilized peoples that man's soul resides in his body or in some part thereof. Hence, whoever consumes the body consumes at the same time the soul. Consequently cannibalism would involve the complete destruction of the victim, body and soul, and constitute the greatest indignity that could be practiced on any enemy as well as the supreme revenge.

In the island of Tanna, in the New Hebrides, to eat an enemy was regarded as the greatest indignity and as worse than throwing his corpse to dogs or swine or mutilating it.⁶⁵ Brunache⁶⁶ was told by an African chief in the French Congo that "it was a very fine thing to enjoy the flesh of a man whom one hates and whom one has killed in battle or a duel." The motives of hatred and revenge are even more forcibly brought out in the case of the Maoris, who inflicted every cruelty on the vanquished before killing and eating them.⁶⁷ The desire for food was often a motive, especially when so many of the enemy were eaten at one time, but the desire for complete vengeance seems to have outweighed it.⁶⁸ Cooking and eating were regarded as the supreme insult.⁶⁹ "It was the utmost degradation to which they could reduce their foes—to eat them!"⁷⁰ Occasionally, however, prisoners were not eaten but were retained as slaves. They were known as *toenga kainga*—"remnant of the feast"—contemptuously implying: "You are not even worth cooking."⁷¹

The Australians ate the flesh of slain enemies chiefly for revenge.⁷² During a corroboree they would sometimes gnaw the bone of an enemy, "thereby exciting themselves to a pitch of madness."⁷³ The desire for complete revenge seems to have been a predominant factor in cannibalism among the Fijians.⁷⁴ Vengeance was even protracted, for "the liver and the hands of an enemy were sometimes preserved by smoke in the house of one whose relations he had slain; and whenever regrets for the dead would wring his heart, the warrior would take down the bundle from the shelf over the fireplace, and cook and eat a portion of his

enemy to assuage his grief. Thus he continued to sate his vengeance for one or two years until all was consumed." But the height of revenge was to cook the body and then leave it in the oven as though unfit for food. "Even to-day the grossest Fijian insult is to call a man *Mbakola* (cannibal meat); the most appalling threat to exclaim, 'Were it not for the government, I would eat you.'"⁷⁵

A branch of the African Ba-Kwese, who are not cannibals, adopted the practice recently by way of reprisal on the cannibalistic Ba-Pindi, with whom they were at war.⁷⁶ The natives of New Britain are said to retain this custom with the view of intimidating their enemies.⁷⁷ Among the Araucanians of South America, cannibalism is mainly an expression of hatred and rage against a slain enemy. They would make the prisoner fast to the trunk of a tree, and taunt and jeer him for hours. When they had worked themselves into a frenzy, they would subject him to a thousand torments, until his captor rushed forward and hacked off a limb or a piece of flesh with a stone or shell knife. "This was the signal for the rest, who came one at a time, each one cutting off a portion of the flesh, until the bones were stripped and life extinct."⁷⁸ The Miranhas of Brazil likewise avenged themselves by eating the enemy, but without this refinement of cruelty.⁷⁹

In higher civilization, when savage and brutal emotions are stirred by war and quarrels, the cannibalistic disposition is apt to crop out.⁸⁰ Beatrice exclaims in *Much Ado about Nothing*: "O God, that I were a man! I would eat his heart in the marketplace." The Homeric Greeks were not cannibals, but in cases of extreme anger they felt the savage desire to devour an enemy.⁸¹ Danish myths contain instances of eating the heart and eyes of an enemy, while the Norse Eddas tell in several places of cutting out the heart of a vanquished foe and drinking his blood.⁸² It is related of an Irish chief of the twelfth century that when his soldiers brought him the head of a man he hated, "he tore the nostrils and lips with his teeth, in a most savage and inhuman manner."⁸³ In 1564, when the Turks executed Vishnevitzky, a brave Polish soldier who had made them much trouble, they ate his heart.⁸⁴

If eating an enemy insults and degrades him, it honors and ennobles, in the savage mind, the person who does the eating. Thus bravado is the counterpart of revenge, and vanity elevates the

perpetrator of the deed. To have devoured a man is an exploit to boast about. Maori chiefs used to take pride in a reputation for cannibalism.⁸⁵ Among the Fijians, "the poles of triumph and of humiliation are touched by the man who eats his enemy and the man who is about to be eaten."⁸⁶ Around the house of a chief were erected stones commemorating the number of men he had eaten, and great prestige and distinction fell to those who had demonstrated their ability in this way. One celebrated chief, Ra-Undri-Undri, had about nine hundred of these stones about his house, and his son affirmed after his death that he had eaten this number of persons himself.⁸⁷

Enemies are also eaten at times as a religious rite or ceremony. In this case cannibalism is usually associated with human sacrifice, the victim being sacrificed and afterward eaten. This was the only form of cannibalism practiced by the Indians of the United States. It prevailed in many tribes.⁸⁸ The Iroquois, who sacrificed prisoners of war to the war gods, ate the flesh later as a religious ceremony, not to satisfy hunger.⁸⁹ It is implied in such instances that the gods are cannibals, even though the people are not. Cannibalism thus survives in the cult, and human sacrifice is evidence of its former prevalence.⁹⁰ Like the Iroquois, the Aztecs ate captives at religious feasts, after the victims had been sacrificed to the gods.⁹¹ In Guatemala the organs of a slain prisoner of war were given to an old prophetess; after eating them she would pray to the gods to provide more captives.⁹² The neighboring nations had "solemn banquets, at which they ate the flesh of their prisoners."⁹³ The Guaranis of Brazil ate their prisoners "in a ceremonious manner,"⁹⁴ *i.e.*, for religious reasons and not to appease their hunger. Religion was also a motive among the Miranhas.⁹⁵

Among the Ba-Mbala of Africa, cannibalism is kept up for other reasons than the fondness for human flesh. It is often associated with religious notions. Before being eaten, the victims are frequently buried for two days, during which period a fire is kept burning on the grave. In the same region cannibalism accompanies the ceremony by which an alliance is established between chiefs.⁹⁶ In the Solomon Islands, when victims are killed and eaten, it is often on religious occasions when such a sacrifice is necessary.⁹⁷ Among the Fijians, cannibalism in some instances is merely ceremonial, a part of their religious rites.⁹⁸

In Australia, human flesh is most frequently eaten for no other reason than that it is required for the proper performance of certain ceremonials.⁹⁹ Only certain parts of the enemy's corpse are consumed. The natives of Victoria, for instance, eat only the kidney fat or the skin of a conquered enemy. The Wotjobaluk of Southeast Australia cut off and eat the arms and legs and occasionally the skin of their slain foes, but use no other parts of the body. The Kulin do likewise. The Bunurong also drink the blood. The Kurnai eat only the muscles of the arms and legs and the skin of the thighs and flanks.¹⁰⁰ In Africa, the Angoni and Basuto eat only the enemy's heart and liver,¹⁰¹ while the Bawenda, in celebration of victory, mix parts of the flesh of the slain with beef and eat the concoction.¹⁰²

These cases represent, in a certain respect, a step away from cannibalism. The same tendency is seen in the drinking of blood. Thus the Nukahivans of the Marquesas drink the blood of an enemy as soon as he is struck down.¹⁰³ This was a regular practice among the early Arabs.¹⁰⁴ "The Scythian soldier," according to Herodotus,¹⁰⁵ "drinks the blood of the first man he overthrows in battle. . . . The skull is used as a drinking-cup." Similar practices prevailed among certain Teutonic peoples, notably the Scordisci.¹⁰⁶ Other survivals of cannibalism are so closely connected with certain religious practices in war that their discussion must be reserved until later. Cannibalism eventually disappeared as a cause and concomitant of war. It was superseded when the domestication of animals provided a substitute supply of meat and when slavery and other methods of utilizing captives more economically were evolved.¹⁰⁷

CHAPTER VI

WAR FOR LAND AND BOOTY

IF we put together all that we have learned from anthropology and ethnography about primitive men and primitive society," says Sumner,¹ "we perceive that the first task of life is to live." In order to live, men must first of all have food, and to gain food they must struggle, for it is only by toil and self-denial that means of subsistence are secured and accumulated. The struggle to wring from nature the necessities of life has ever been the great problem of humanity. It was the first to tax men's thoughts and energies, and it has always been the fundamental factor in existence.

The struggle to live is essentially a struggle for food, and as food and all other necessities of life come ultimately from the soil, the struggle has been to gain more from a piece of land or to acquire additional land. In the first case man has used his ingenuity to devise means of extracting from nature the supplies he needs. The tools and processes he has developed to aid him in this task are known as the arts of life. Corresponding to them are the stages of self-maintenance, which represent the different ways by which groups have gained their livelihood, such as hunting, fishing, cattle raising, and agriculture. These can be roughly classified in the above order as to development and complexity, with hunting and fishing at the lower end of the series and agriculture at the higher. It should be noted, however, that they do not constitute an evolutionary series in the sense that all peoples must pass through them in that order. We know, for example, "that while hunting belongs without question to one of the earliest economic pursuits it persists through all subsequent stages; that agriculture was practiced by many tribes that had never passed through a pastoral stage, nor kept domesticated animals, excepting the dog, a condition exemplified by many tribes of North America. Again, in Negro Africa, agriculture and pastoral life

are pursued on an equally wide scale."² But in general it is true that more necessities of life are derived from a given area as it is used successively for these different purposes. The development of the arts, therefore, has made it possible to derive more from the land.

But as we have already seen, there is another prime factor or condition of life—the number of people to be maintained with these supplies. If land is abundant and fertile and the population relatively small, existence is easy, but if many people are living on a relatively small tract of land, the struggle to live is intensified. The situation facing every group is, therefore, framed in terms of the relation of mouths to food, or, since all food comes from the soil, of population to land. Certain preventive checks, such as abortion and infanticide, may bring about some adjustment and keep numbers down to a certain level,³ but if these factors are not effective, overpopulation occurs and the group is hard pressed for existence. It is then compelled either to produce more from its land or to acquire additional land. The first alternative is a slow and difficult process; the latter offers more immediate relief. Hence, when the land becomes overpopulated, that is, when there are more mouths to feed than there is food to feed them, or even before this stage is reached, groups are impelled to move on to new lands. Thus have resulted the countless migrations of history and prehistory.⁴

The desire for more or better land, in order to improve the conditions of life, has been called earth-hunger. It may also arise from a desire to raise the standard of living. Even when a district is not overpopulated, the people may want better means of subsistence in order to live on a higher standard and may be impelled, not only to make improvements in the arts, but also to move on to better lands, attracted by the opportunity of securing more for their labor. Earth-hunger in this latter form has also led to land-grabbing, and among more advanced societies has probably been of greater influence.⁵

Most primitive tribes derive their means of subsistence chiefly from hunting or herding; few subsist wholly by fishing or farming. To live by the former means requires a relatively large

amount of land, since it involves constant moving about in search of hunting or grazing grounds and since the land is used only extensively and temporarily for its usufruct alone. Hence groups are driven to seek fresh land.⁶ In so doing, however, they usually encounter other groups competing for the land or already in possession. Tribal boundaries are generally well defined,⁷ and any trespass or other aggression is met with resistance. Thus the competition of life leads to conflict.

The encroachment of one hunting tribe on the lands of another was a persistent cause of hostilities among the American Indians, who were very jealous of their boundaries.⁸ Near the mouth of the Mackenzie River, warfare arising from violation of tribal boundaries was incessant; anyone found hunting out of his own territory was slain. The disputed right of the Flatheads to hunt buffalo at the eastern foot of the Rockies was the cause of long-continued hostility with the Blackfeet.⁹ Encroachment on the hunting grounds of other tribes was a cause of war among the Central Californians, the Omahas, and the tribes of the lower Mississippi valley and elsewhere.¹⁰ The wild tribes of the valley of Mexico "attacked all who entered their domain, whether for hunting, collecting fruit, or fighting."¹¹

One of the most frequent causes of war in Australia was hunting on the lands of another tribe. The unauthorized killing of game was certain to lead to fighting.¹² In Tasmania, as in Australia, boundaries of hunting grounds were rigorously fixed, and to overstep them was to expose one's self to the risk of death.¹³ Disputes over boundaries were the commonest cause of bloodshed among the Maoris. Next came women. Hence the Maori proverb: "Land and women are the roots of war."¹⁴ Among other Polynesian tribes, annexation of land and hunting in disputed districts were a frequent source of hostilities,¹⁵ while among the Ainu of Japan, "the quarrels and fights were generally caused by the men of one village or district hunting over the grounds recognized as belonging to the people of another."¹⁶

Among herders, wars for land are even more frequent and sanguinary. Pastoral tribes are more populous and are constantly on the move. In Africa, especially in the south and east, a life-and-

death struggle for the possession of the water holes and grazing grounds has led to incessant warfare with the extermination of many tribes and the forced migration and dissolution of innumerable others.¹⁷ The more or less civilized herders of today are frequently at war for similar reasons, and the historical migrations and invasions of barbaric races into Europe, Asia, and elsewhere belong in the same category.¹⁸ Among the Bedouins, the chief cause of war is jealousy over watering places and pastures, while grazing grounds and the right to use the streams for irrigation purposes are a fertile source of quarrels among the Berbers of Morocco.¹⁹

Quarrels over boundaries and struggles for new land are not confined to hunters and herders, but are also found, though to a lesser degree, among agricultural and fishing peoples. Fishing is a sedentary occupation and infrequently gives rise to war. When fishing districts are well defined, however, trespass by another tribe may lead to war. This was not unusual in Polynesia.²⁰ Fishing became a source of friction in another way among the Indians of northern California. "When one people obstructed the river with their weir, thereby preventing the ascent of salmon, there was nothing left for those above but to fight or starve."²¹ Such instances, however, are rare, and fishing may be classed as a peaceful occupation.

Agricultural tribes are also relatively sedentary, for they must usually remain in one place in order to harvest the crop which they have planted. Since they move about less, they avoid in a measure the endless hostile encounters characteristic of nomadic tribes and are less frequently engaged in war. They are, nevertheless, susceptible to earth-hunger and may encroach on other lands when compelled by necessity or attracted by the greater fertility of the soil. Thus quarrels may arise.

Among the agricultural Indians conflicts over land were not infrequent.²² The lower Californians engaged in bloody wars over disputed boundaries; these generally occurred about fruit and seed time. Internecine wars arose from contentions over property and water rights among the agricultural Indians of the southwest.²³ "Tribal boundaries furnished endless cause of provocation

to war" among the Canary Island tillers.²⁴ The chief cause of war among the African Bageshu is the encroachment upon the lands of another clan. "They jealously guard the boundaries of their land, and if another clan steps over the bounds to cultivate, they enforce their right by resorting to arms."²⁵ The natives of Borneo²⁶ and of the Fiji Islands²⁷ frequently fought over their fields. The civilized Iranians waged war chiefly for new agricultural land.²⁸ "The Dorian conquest was the work of a poor and hardy tribe whose native mountains no longer afforded it sustenance, and which therefore went forth to seek with the sword its fortune in distant lands. The Greek colonies arose from the same motives partly through plundering raids which ended like those of the Northmen in conquest and settlement, partly through peaceful emigration. The later wars, both foreign and domestic, were due to the same cause, namely, the struggle for land and food."²⁹

Land is desirable, not so much for itself as for the means of subsistence which are derived from it alone. These are obtained by toil and accumulated by self-denial. They may be consumed immediately or reserved for the future. Material goods set aside for future use represent energy stored up against the struggle for existence. They are, in a word, capital.³⁰ They invite aggression, since, if seized, they relieve the conquerors to some extent of the burden of working the land for themselves. Hence, before a group can derive benefit and satisfaction from its accumulated products, it must assert its right to them, by force of arms if necessary. The right to property has always been decided by force, and only a group which can beat off aggressors retains this right.³¹ "To the victors belong the spoils" is a doctrine as old as history. Thus the products of the land, even more than the land itself, invite aggression and defense and furnish a cause of war.

Men have always been enticed by the hope of getting something for nothing. Pillaging another group has seemed a realization of this hope and has been considered until recently a legitimate way of gaining a living.³² It is an easy substitute for the arduous task of actual production and accumulation, and is further attractive

because of the excitement of war and the variety it offers in the monotony of a humdrum existence.

While plunder has in all times and places been a result of war, the conquerors taking whatever portable things of value they find,⁸³ the desire for it has also been one of the commonest causes of war. This is especially true of primitive society, where property is for the most part portable. Effective conquest, as the term is understood in civilized warfare, is practically unknown, since savages, owing to their mode of living, rarely desire territory for permanent use, and since they lack the political development necessary to extend their dominion.⁸⁴ Wars for booty or plunder are especially prevalent where the accumulation of property is considerable and tribes are nomadic.⁸⁵ They offer a tangible and actual advantage to the conqueror, as even Norman Angell⁸⁶ admits, for, where wealth consists chiefly of movable property, the victor is enriched by exploiting and enslaving the vanquished. Many tribes even make their entire living this way. Robbing the out-group is regarded as a perfectly normal source of livelihood, as legitimate as agriculture or any other mode of self-maintenance. This "Bedouin livelihood," as Lippert⁸⁷ has termed it from its prevalence among nomadic pastoral tribes, has survived until modern times. It has been followed on the sea—piracy—as well as on land.

The prospect of booty and reprisal for theft are among the foremost reasons why primitive men fight.⁸⁸ Such warfare is practically universal, as the scattered cases in Appendix G will reveal. It is common enough in Asia, Oceania, and America, but its classic ground is Africa.

Wars for booty are also characteristic of more cultured peoples. The ancient Iranians were constantly beset by northern barbarians bent on plunder, and they waged frequent wars of retaliation.⁸⁹ The ancient Hebrews not infrequently waged wars for plunder, carrying off spoils of every description and leaving their enemies stripped of every visible means of support.⁴⁰ The foray was, in fact, the type of warfare best suited to the geographical conditions of Palestine. On the south, Judah was exposed to the Amalekites and other predatory tribes; on the east lay the Midianite and Moabite freebooters; on the west were the raiding

Philistines.⁴¹ The great war-motive of the Homeric Age was the desire for plunder. "Booty-wars were a regular practice on land, and were not dishonorable. On the sea and coast, piracy was as common and as little reprehended."⁴² Even at the time of Thucydides successful piracy was honored in certain parts of north-western Greece, and the early Greek cities such as Athens, Sparta, and Mycenae, were built at some distance from the sea because of its prevalence.⁴³ The splendor of Rome was largely due to the booty and tribute of the provinces. The northern barbarians regarded war as an honorable source of gain and waged it in order to provide themselves with the necessities of life.⁴⁴ Plunder was admittedly a prominent motive throughout the period of discovery and colonization, when Europeans were lured by tales of limitless wealth in the outlying continents. The same incentive to war is evident in more recent times. The Kurdish tribes of the Ottoman Empire are for the most part nomadic bands of robbers.⁴⁵ Among the Bedouins, warfare usually takes the form of plundering expeditions. These tribes persistently rob one another, and, if opportunity offers, they carry off the tents and all that they contain. In Arabia the Wahábys fight to propagate their faith, but they invade Irak, Mesopotamia, and Syria for the sake of plunder.⁴⁶ By the Berbers of Morocco "plunder of passers-by is looked upon as quite a respectable method of subsistence, and excursions are often made to the lowlands or to the outskirts of some city for this purpose."⁴⁷

Pastoral tribes, as we have seen, are particularly given to this Bedouin mode of livelihood. Their form of self-maintenance necessitates a wandering life and brings them into endless conflicts with other tribes. The need of protecting the herds and of resisting aggression leads to a greater concentration of population than among hunters, and constant warfare develops leadership, discipline, and a patriarchal organization.⁴⁸ Pastoral tribes are therefore well organized for war, and their mode of living furnishes constant opportunities for the exercise of their ability in this respect. They are invariably at war,⁴⁹ for they always have an incentive to fight—they can enrich themselves by a successful raid. Plunder in their case consists chiefly of live stock. Any tribe

which captures the cattle of another is so much wealthier and better equipped to meet the struggle for existence.

The hold of cattle upon pastoral peoples is truly remarkable. They regard cattle raising as a "noble" occupation; pay the greatest consideration to their cattle; they even think in terms of cattle and apportion social distinction on the basis of ownership of cattle. They furnish a clear-cut case of the basic nature of the self-maintenance mores, of the predominant influence of the tribe's mode of livelihood on every other phase of its culture pattern.⁵⁰

It is said of the Bahima of Africa that "they form warm attachments for the animals, some of them they love like children, pet and talk to them, coax them, and weep over their ailments; should a favourite die their grief is extreme, and cases are not unknown in which men have committed suicide on the loss of a favourite animal."⁵¹ To a Mkamba, "his greatest pride and joy are his cattle, nothing else has the same value in his eyes." His wife is a secondary consideration, "for after all she is only valued as a portion of the herd."⁵² The economic basis of Dinka society is the possession of cattle. Their currency is cattle, the bride-price is paid in cattle, quarrels are settled by the payment of cattle as fines or compensation, and raids are made for cattle. Property, therefore, to a Dinka means cattle.⁵³ Among them nothing confers such prestige and position as the possession of large herds, and the authority of a chief who loses his cattle is usually severely impaired. When attacked, the men employ themselves in driving the cattle to a place of safety or in defending them, their sole object being to protect, not their homes and families, but their herds. "There is in this curious cattle-craft," writes Cummins,⁵⁴ "a note of distinction that relieves the otherwise sordid picture of the Dinka's life. The warrior who is too practical to resist superior force in defence of his homestead or relations will often display reckless gallantry in attempts to rescue or defend his herds." Cattle have a similar hold on the imagination of the Bechuana. Their possession assures social position. A common saying is: "The person who has no cattle is nothing at all of a person." Cattle are not merely the chief wealth of these people; they are even regarded as the clan-gods of their fathers.⁵⁵

Horses have a similar hold on some peoples, for example on the Yakuts, whose whole life was centered on horse-raising. "There their best instincts were nourished; arts and handicrafts took their origin;

songs and legends were composed; the system of their group-life was developed and strengthened. There they acquired the custom of enduring misfortune and conquering hardships in friendship and in common." Everything that they did in former times reflected the character of the powerful animals which then constituted their chief wealth and the basis of their existence.⁵⁶

Since pastoral peoples are so deeply influenced by their cattle, and desire them so greatly, they are naturally ever ready to steal the cattle of other tribes. What Northcote⁵⁷ says of the Kavirondo in particular applies generally to all primitive herders: "In character they are naturally very honest, except with regard to cattle, a temptation which no East African can withstand." Thus cattle stealing becomes a customary method of augmenting one's own herds and is so deeply ingrained in the mores that it is regarded as perfectly proper and right.⁵⁸ Livingstone⁵⁹ pertinently remarks: "In tribes which have been accustomed to cattle-stealing, the act is not considered immoral, in the way that theft is. Before I knew the [Makololo] language well, I said to a chief, 'You stole the cattle of so and so.' 'No, I did not steal them,' was the reply, 'I only *lifted* them.' The word *gapa* is identical with the Highland term for the same deed." Cattle lifting, according to their mores, is entirely legitimate; it is thus that they make their living. War for cattle is normal, and it is incessant. For tribes living by plunder, to renounce war would mean to abandon their main source of livelihood; peace for them would be abnormal.

Africa affords a wealth of illustrations of the desire for booty, viz., cattle, as a cause of war. Throughout the continent, wherever cattle raising is the chief occupation, cattle lifting is the most frequent *casus belli*.

Among the Galla and Abyssinians, who wage war for cattle, each warrior receives a certain portion of the booty, the leader getting the lion's share.⁶⁰ By far the majority of East African wars are over cattle. The pastoral Vanika make war only to steal cattle while the chief occupation of the Masai is the same. "The Masai do not do, nor will they do, any form of work whatsoever beyond tending their cattle and raiding. . . . Their whole life is spent in breeding cattle and stealing it. All fighting comes incidentally. Their greed for cattle is insatiable." They,

too, are occasionally raided, however, and warriors, fully armed, guard the cattle day and night.⁶¹

Among the Dinkas, "every raid has for its object the acquisition of stock, and for its justification, the story of some former raid by the enemy upon the intending raiders." Practically all their wars arise from theft of cattle or reprisal for theft. From Gebet Shambe to Waw Station are four Dinka clans, each at war with all the others, and cattle raids are constantly occurring and affording fresh pretexts for hostility. The Agar, the richest and most warlike clan, are a source of dread to all their neighbors. Each clan and tribe is continually impelled to defend or acquire cattle, and this necessity has greatly developed the military qualities of the Dinkas.⁶² The Golos are exempt from Dinka raids because they have nothing to attract the raiders. The seroot fly and other pests render it impossible for cattle to live in their country. They are a quiet, peace-loving people.⁶³

The Akamba, whose greatest pride and joy is their cattle, are continuously raiding and being raided for cattle. About 1850, they made war against the Galla, robbing them of their herds and driving them out of Kitui, only later to fall victims themselves to the incessant raids of the Masai, who robbed them of enormous quantities of stock. The tribe must be ever on guard against raiders, and in order that the whole herd may not be lost, portions of it are kept in various parts of the country. The neighboring Theraka, like the Golos, have been free from raids; they are too poor to attract the Masai.⁶⁴

In the Baringo District of East Africa, deadly wars for cattle and grazing grounds have rendered it practically impossible for some tribes to graze their stock in safety anywhere. The Masai or other warlike raiders frequently rob them of the greater part of their herds. As soon as a weak tribe accumulates a few head of cattle, it becomes the prey of every tribe strong enough to take its property by force, and some tribes have been robbed and harassed to such an extent that they have had to flee to the hills.⁶⁵ The chief occupation of the Bahima is herding; they are a peaceable people, seldom making war on other tribes, for the reason that they have plenty to live on themselves. "Nevertheless, they have ever to be on the defensive, for other tribes have always looked upon their vast herds of cattle with jealous eyes, and whenever the chance has presented itself they have pounced down upon, and tried to carry off one of the herds." They themselves sometimes cannot resist the temptation to steal a few unprotected cows. War may result, though it is a rare occurrence.⁶⁶

In Nyassaland and the surrounding districts, cattle raids have been

incessant; the greatest offenders are the Angoni.⁶⁷ In Madagascar, the Sákalávas are ever ready to carry off the cattle and plunder the farmsteads of their Hova neighbors.⁶⁸ In South Africa war resolves itself into a cattle hunt.⁶⁹ Many of the destructive raids of the Zulus have been for the purpose of seizing the cattle of other tribes.⁷⁰ Fritsch⁷¹ says that South African warfare degenerates easily into cattle lifting, even with Europeans. War is the favorite occupation of the Kaffirs, not, says Fritsch, because they are bloodthirsty, but because it suggests the thought of booty—in cattle—and the expectation of feasting and reveling on a rich meat diet. Among the Hottentots, cattle are practically the sole cause of war; continual strife results from the theft of herds and the encroachment on or wanton destruction of grazing-grounds. The Makololo and Matabele are described as addicted to cattle raids.⁷² The Watuta destroyed villages in every direction, carrying off the live stock and, when one country was desolated, seeking plunder in fresh fields.⁷³ The Bakgalagadi once possessed enormous herds, but they were despoiled of them and driven into the desert.⁷⁴

Theft of live stock is the commonest cause of war among the Ba-Mbala.⁷⁵ In Togoland wars are usually undertaken for the sake of cattle and other booty.⁷⁶ The principal pastime of the Buduma of Lake Chad seems to be lifting cattle from the mainland. Their chief industry is tending herds, many of which, in true border fashion, they have stolen from other tribes, and their daring raids are the terror of the mainland tribes.⁷⁷

In India, cattle play a minor rôle in the national economy for the reason that they are held sacred and hence cannot be killed for food.⁷⁸ In Káfiristan, however, this is not so, and marauding expeditions for cattle and goats are frequently undertaken.⁷⁹ In northeastern Asia cattle raising is more prevalent and wars for cattle more frequent. In all the legends and traditions of the Yakuts, for example, the stealing of cattle is represented as one of the commonest causes of war.⁸⁰ The American aborigines were not herders. But the southwestern Indians in obtaining domesticated animals from the whites acquired therewith a new cause of war. The Apaches, for example, soon learned to conduct persistent raids against the Pima, carrying off whatever stock they could lay hands upon.⁸¹ When the horse was introduced to the Plains, horse stealing became a prime cause of war, as among the Omahas.⁸²

Wars over cattle have also been common among more cultured peoples.

The Hebrews of the Old Testament raided their enemies, carrying off all the live stock they possibly could, and gloated over the large number of sheep, oxen, goats, asses, etc., they had captured.⁸³ According to the Egyptian inscriptions, expeditions were sent out for plunder, principally cattle, which were captured in large quantities.⁸⁴ In the Homeric age, cattle lifting was the usual cause of war. It was regarded as "a legitimate method of replenishing one's flocks and herds and gaining wealth. . . . A common way of meeting death, for a brave man, was to be slain while cattle-lifting; Odysseus asked Agamemnon in the spirit-world if he had been killed on such an expedition; there was no shame in it."⁸⁵

The Kurdish tribes of the present day are great cattle thieves.⁸⁶ The Bedouins are likewise given to marauding expeditions; when attacking an encampment their chief concern is to drive away the horses and camels. Sometimes whatever they take in a successful raid is shared according to previous agreement; in other cases, every horseman plunders for himself, and "whatever an Arab first touches with his lance is regarded as his sole property; thus, if a herd of camels be found, every one hastens to touch with his lance as many as he can before any other person, calling out as he touches each, 'O N***, bear witness! O Z***, behold thou art mine.'" ⁸⁷ The Berbers of Morocco also wage war mainly for the plunder they secure, making excursions to carry off the droves of steeds and oxen which have been sent out to graze. "All goods and chattels, cattle even, become the property of the first to lay his hands upon them, though the loot is as often as not shared amongst the victors."⁸⁸

Besides raiding one another for cattle, pastoral nomads consistently prey on agriculturists for the produce of the soil. This is an example of the immemorial conflict between herders and tillers. The former are invariably more warlike and predatory than the latter, whose sedentary occupation is more conducive to peaceableness. Our own frontier society furnishes an example in the conflict and antagonism between the "fence" and "no-fence" men. Ethnography contains many other instances.

The warlike Matabele of South Africa are a scourge to all the neighboring agriculturists, as are the Sákalávas of Madagascar, who

plunder the fields of the Hovas.⁸⁹ Among the Chin Hill tribes of India, there was until quite recently a "raiding season," extending approximately from October to March, after the crops had been gathered and when there was no work of great importance to be done in the fields. "It was then that the hillmen perpetrated atrocities in the plains, kept the tea-planters of Assam on the alert, and almost annihilated the wretched border subjects of the king of Ava."⁹⁰ Similarly the Koiari, who inhabit the mountains of the interior of New Guinea, "go down to the coast occasionally for the purpose of robbing the plantations of the Motu;" and the people of Tatana, near Port Moresby, who have no plantations, live by plundering those who have.⁹¹ The Toaripians, a New Guinea coast tribe, "verily believed that they had a right to take what they desired from every plantation they found." When the inhabitants fled upon their arrival, they would strip each plantation of everything they could carry away.⁹² In the Marquesas Islands the same antagonism between mountain and plains tribes existed; each group waged war to rob the other of its produce. "The mountaineers would covet the fruit of the bread-tree from the inhabitants on the plain, and these latter used to climb the mountains to steal the fehi which grew in the high places."⁹³ In the New World the conflict between nomads and tillers is best seen in the case of the Apaches and Pimas. The Pimas tilled the ground and were peaceful, limiting their warfare to punishing the raids made upon them by other tribes, especially the nomadic and warlike Apaches.⁹⁴

This situation occasionally develops into "group-slavery," best seen in the systematic exploitation of tillers by nomads. An excellent example is furnished by the Masai, "true warriors and raiders" who keep a subject tribe to do their hunting and tilling.⁹⁵

In Nyassaland, the Asenga, Atumbuka, and Achipeta are subject to the warlike and dominant Angoni, while the unwarlike Manganja have been enslaved by their neighbors, the Ajawa and Angoni.⁹⁶ The Bechuanas conquered the Makalahari and made them slaves. The latter are forced to live in the western districts, where game is plentiful, and are required to kill the game and bring the spoils to their masters, who live in regions where water is more abundant.⁹⁷ The Vaganda are likewise subject to the Vahuma; the Makololo hold the Makalaka in serfdom; the Masarva—descendants of Bechuanas and Bushmen—are slaves to the Bechuanas, Matabele, and Marsute, in whose land they dwell.⁹⁸ The Ba-Yaka enslave the tribes they conquer.⁹⁹ The Bakgalagadi are now the serfs of the Batlhaping, Barolong, and Bahurut-

she.¹⁰⁰ The Yalunka, near the Niger, are permitted by the Sofas, their conquerors, "to subsist on the condition of living practically in slavery and assisting them in every way."¹⁰¹

Ratzel¹⁰² has made an enlightening map of Africa showing how extensively pastoral tribes are masters of agriculturalists. The area extends across the entire continent north of the equator and along the eastern coast to the southeast interior. The agricultural tribes, moreover, are surrounded and hemmed in on all sides by herders.

As further illustrations of group-slavery, the Hupa of California held their neighbors in subjection and tributary servitude,¹⁰³ the Chanés of South America were enslaved by the Chiriguanos,¹⁰⁴ and the Maoris of New Zealand kept tribes conquered in war as vassals.¹⁰⁵ The Arabs hold the negroes of Borku in subjection and rob them of their date harvest, and in other parts of the same region a nomad group rules over a settled group of the same population.¹⁰⁶ The Tuareg are divided into powerful "noble tribes" and vassal or slave tribes.¹⁰⁷ The Israelites entered Canaan as nomads and became the overlords of the Canaanites.¹⁰⁸ The Hyksos invasion of Egypt is another case in point; it was attended by all the contempt of men on one grade of civilized effort for those on another.¹⁰⁹

Man himself may be the booty of war. We have already reviewed war for cannibalistic motives. The seizure of enemies as slaves is also a prominent object of warfare. Often the captives are women, and this, as will be seen below, has given rise to the practice of wife-capture. In any case, war is undertaken with the intent to improve the economic status of the tribe and to aid it in its struggle for existence by capturing enemies and putting them to work, by selling them, or by ransoming them for a profit.

Except in certain parts of Africa where the slave trade is highly developed and war is conducted to obtain prisoners for the market, war for human booty or slaves is usually waged in order to get workers who will do the disagreeable but necessary tasks. "Everywhere," says Spencer,¹¹⁰ "the tendency is for one man to make another man work for him." This applies chiefly to agriculture and in part to fishing, tasks which are monotonous and arduous and which men like to force others to do. Fighting, hunting,

and herding, as we have already seen, are regarded by most primitive peoples as the only worthy occupations. They are interesting, exciting, and much more to the savage liking than the drudgery of tilling, weeding, and other agricultural operations. Thus when tribes come to depend upon agriculture for their chief means of subsistence, and there is more work than the women can do, the men prefer to compel enemies to assist the women rather than perform the monotonous labor themselves. Slavery is also prompted by feelings of ethnocentrism, the desire to get something for nothing, and "the love of dominion which belongs to vanity."¹¹¹

It is on the agricultural stage that slavery first develops into a real institution.¹¹² On lower stages, no prisoners of war are taken, or if taken, they are eaten, tortured, sacrificed, or, in a few cases, adopted. These are the only ways primitive man knows how to utilize or treat his captured foes. Among more advanced tribes slaves are occasionally kept for domestic work, but it is not until the agricultural stage is reached that praedial slavery is found. Slaves become of such economic importance that prisoners of war are invariably enslaved and a traffic in human beings grows up. The slave market is kept supplied by wars waged for this special purpose. The demand for slaves stimulates expeditions for conquest and has produced genuine conquering races, particularly in Africa.¹¹³

Slavery is in some cases an incident rather than an object of warfare. It is an incident where it is the mode of treating prisoners; it is an object where aggressions are made for the purpose of securing prisoners to work or to sell. Slavery as a method of treating prisoners of war is discussed below. Under present consideration are the instances of wars primarily to obtain slaves.

From time immemorial the Africans have enslaved one another and have been enslaved by other peoples.¹¹⁴ Slavery has been so much their lot that the word Negro suggests slave, and *vice versa*. In French the terms for slave dealer and the slave trade are *négrier* and *traite des nègres*, while many of our expressions, such as "to work like a nigger," have the same connotation. The earliest Egyptian paintings portray Negro slaves. For centuries European traders and shippers aggravated the condition of slavery

already existing in Africa by promoting wars and raids for the sake of human merchandise, and more recently their rôle has been taken over by the Arabs.¹¹⁵ Throughout the continent slavery rivals cattle lifting as the chief cause of war.

The Oromó of northeastern Africa make predatory raids upon their neighbors in order to capture prisoners, which they take to the nearest slave market and sell to the Arab slave traders for the current price. Islam introduced slavery to the Afar and Somali. The Abyssinians wage war for one of two purposes—for cattle or for slaves.¹¹⁶ Most East African wars are for the same objects.¹¹⁷ The history of the Swahili coast is the history of successive Arab conquests to obtain slaves, while the Swahilis, who are half Arab and half Negro, have made slaves in every direction.¹¹⁸ In the lake region of East Central Africa war is primarily a slave hunt. "A dangerous neighbor or rival can be effectually curbed by carrying away a large number of his subjects and sending them to the market. This resolves war largely into raiding by means of a sudden and unexpected descent."¹¹⁹ In Azimba and Chipitaland war was undertaken chiefly to secure captives for the market—the buyers in this case were the Portuguese—and in Nyassaland the Angoni pursued a slave-raiding career until British occupation put an end to it. They captured slave women to marry and men to help them fight.¹²⁰

The Libollos of Angola waged war whenever the opportunity was presented of procuring prisoners as slaves.¹²¹ The Ba-Djoke harried the country of the Ba-Pindi and carried off many slaves to Portuguese territory, until they were finally beaten off. The Ba-Pindi are cannibals, and buy slaves from the Tu-Kongo for eating. After one of their numerous wars the Ba-Bunda were obliged to pay an indemnity, composed partly of slaves, to the Bakwa-Mosinga, and the Ba-Mbala lost many of their people as slaves in their earlier wars.¹²² When the Kajurawa forced the Kagoro to pay tribute, the latter sent out parties to capture passing strangers whom they handed over to their conquerors, a practice which has only recently been stopped.¹²³

In Togoland war is conducted entirely for booty—cattle or slaves. Salaga, the capital of the Gonya kingdom, owed its sudden growth and prosperity to the slave trade. Situated in the western Sudan, it was the chief market for slaves brought from Central Africa. Thence they were secretly transported through the territory occupied by Europeans to the Gold and Slave Coasts of

West Africa. In earlier times about 15,000 slaves were sold annually in the market of Salaga. Klose¹²⁴ has described the ruin wrought by slave raids: "Murder and incendiarism are the orders in this business. Great villages and districts are depopulated and made deserts by the raids." Although today this human merchandise cannot be sent overseas, the Mohammedan courts still use numbers of slaves, and almost all the chiefs and wealthy men in Togo keep slaves, who cultivate the fields and form the working class. Klose says that it is not in Negro nature to submit voluntarily to work and that a certain measure of force is essential; for this reason he thinks slavery is necessary in West Africa.

On the Loango Coast the slaves are partly obtained by plundering excursions made in the interior.¹²⁵ Around Lake Chad, the Kotoko make slave raids and sell the captives to the Buduma, who use them to do the fishing.¹²⁶ The social order of the West African kingdom of Benin rested on a basis of slavery; its slaves were largely drawn from the Sobo country to the east. Benin was always at war with its neighbors to obtain captives to be used as slaves or sold.¹²⁷ Among the Ewe-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast, "kidnapping is extremely common; for, man being a marketable commodity, it is as profitable to steal him as to steal merchandise."¹²⁸

The kingdom of Dahomey was the great slave producer and man hunter for the European slave trade. Its primary object in every campaign was to secure prisoners for the slave market. Dahomey is a military kingdom reared by war and the slave trade. Under Trudo, its founder, it began a career of conquest which lasted until it had overthrown the mercantile states and forced a way to the sea, thereby getting possession of the slave trade and dealing directly with the European traders. To supply the necessary thousands for this traffic, Dahomey entered upon a career of warfare, of predatory raids upon the surrounding tribes, which has lasted until recent times. The export slave trade came to an end in 1864, when a steamer which had successfully run several cargoes of slaves to Brazil was captured, but the annual slave hunts still continue, for a ready market for slaves is found among the Mohammedan tribes about the Niger. Most of the slaves

brought to the United States and other countries of the New World came from this section of the west coast of Africa.¹²⁹

Slavery, slave raids, slave markets, and the slave trade still continue in Abyssinia, French, British, and Italian Somaliland, Eritrea, Egypt, Tripoli, the Libyan Desert, Morocco, Rio de Oro, Liberia, the Sudan, the Hedjaz, Arabia, Afghanistan, Tibet, in most independent Mohammedan states, and several other territories. This statement is based upon the report presented to the League of Nations in September, 1925, by its Temporary Slavery Commission, composed of British, French, Belgian, Portuguese, and Dutch officials with much experience in colonial administration.¹³⁰

In India the Angami and other Naga tribes made frequent raids to capture slaves. "The inhabitants of a raided village would be carried off into captivity until ransomed by their friends."¹³¹ This practice differs but slightly from making prisoners to sell in the slave market, for the raiders derive a money value in either case and thus find raiding profitable.

In New Guinea, slave hunts are a fruitful source of hostility and uneasiness, especially in the southwest of the Dutch Protectorate. The natives often fall victim to the yearly slave raids and are thus always on the *qui vive*.¹³² In Bougainville, Choiseul, and other Solomon Islands, war for slaves was continuous.¹³³ Among Polynesian tribes also, one motive for war was to capture prisoners and enslave them. The Hawaiians, Tahitians, and Maoris all made slaves to aid in tilling the soil, the last-named requiring them also for their feasts.¹³⁴

In the New World instances of war for slaves are numerous. The slaveholding tribes were, in general, those who had made some advance in the arts; even without becoming husbandmen, fishers and traders found it advantageous to enslave their prisoners of war.¹³⁵ Thus the Tlingits of Alaska, who were well advanced in the arts though not agricultural, practiced slavery extensively. The desire to obtain slaves in order to increase the power of the chief and his clan was the commonest incentive to war among them. Here we see a political motive added to that of self-maintenance. The Tlingits were also great traders, and carried on a regular slave trade with the south.¹³⁶ The Salish tribes of British Columbia carried off into slavery the women and children of their enemies, while the Columbians conducted an active slave trade, capturing or kidnapping their southern neighbors

and selling them to the northern tribes. The Chinooks kept slaves, obtained through war or trade, and forced them to do all the drudgery. Among the Nootka, "war and kidnapping supply the slave-market, and no captive, whatever his rank in his own tribe, can escape this fate, except by a heavy ransom." According to Sproat the Classetts of Puget Sound encouraged the slave-hunting incursions of the Nootkas against their weaker neighbors. All the tribes of Puget Sound held slaves acquired by war and kidnapping and sold them in large numbers to the northern tribes. They treated them like dogs and often killed them.¹³⁷

These cases show the former prevalence of slavery among the northwestern Indians. The course of their extensive traffic in slaves was generally from south to north, and from the coast inland. The Tsimshian acted as middlemen. The southern tribes kidnapped or captured slaves and sold them to the Tsimshian, who resold them to the Tlingits and interior Tinneh. Most of these tribes live mainly by fishing, have a great variety of foods and preserve much for winter use, possess fixed habitations, and live in groups of considerable size. These circumstances greatly favor the growth of slavery. A settled life makes escape difficult. Living in large groups, made possible by plentiful food, leads to a high organization of freemen and thus to a strong coercive power over slaves. The work is suited to slave labor, and the preservation of food creates a demand for workers. These tribes are also great traders, another condition favoring the growth of slavery. An organized slave trade facilitates the keeping of slaves by transporting them to great distances from their native country and thus diminishing the opportunities for escape.¹³⁸ For all of these reasons slavery prevailed throughout this region despite the absence of agriculture. These tribes are the most important exception to the rule that slavery is characteristic of the agricultural stage.

Relatively few other tribes in North America waged war for slaves. The Indians of Virginia, the Algonquin, and the Choctaw, however, are said to have enslaved the women and children of their enemies, and slaves were used in the fields in the Mississippi valley. The Illinois obtained slaves in the south and sold them in the west.¹³⁹ The Pima captured Yuma and Apache children and forwarded them to Tucson, Altar, or Guaymas, selling them to the Spaniards or Mexicans.¹⁴⁰ Slaves were also kept by other tribes, but in these cases slavery appears to have been rather a result than an object of warfare. It is interesting to note that the Europeans found it practically impossible to enslave the Indians and that this was one of the main reasons why natives

from Africa were imported. It is of further interest to recall that some of the Indians themselves kept Negro slaves, often in fairly large numbers. This was especially true of the Five Civilized Tribes, who were farther advanced in agriculture than most of the aborigines.¹⁴¹

Desire for slaves was an incentive to war among the ancient nations of Honduras.¹⁴² In South America similar cases occur. The Guaycurus waged "frequent wars to get captives, whom they kept in stringent servitude."¹⁴³ In the valley of the Yapura, in the first half of the nineteenth century, prisoners of war were enslaved and very severely treated.¹⁴⁴ When the Europeans arrived on the scene the aborigines sold their war captives to them.¹⁴⁵

Among the ancient Greeks, in the time of foreign war, "human booty was one of the greatest incentives." The men were usually taken prisoners, "not for the sake of their services as workers, but for their ransom or for their price when sold to foreigners." The captured women and children, however, were retained as work slaves.¹⁴⁶ The wars of the early Arabs were of two kinds, plundering excursions and wars of revenge. In the former case the object was to take prisoners. Sometimes they were put to work, but more often they were taken to the slave market of some such trading place as Mecca and sold out of the country.¹⁴⁷ The ancient Hebrews carried off thousands of the enemy, particularly women and children though sometimes men, along with other booty,¹⁴⁸ and the Egyptians rivaled them in this respect.¹⁴⁹

CHAPTER VII

WAR AND WOMEN

MEN have fought for and over women since time immemorial. Disputes involving women are especially prevalent in primitive societies, where the chief cause of trouble is the capture of women from other tribes. Within the group woman-capture is very exceptional, since it is a practice tending to destroy the unity of the group and weakening it for its encounters with other groups. Hence it was early selected out; tribes adhering to it tended to succumb in the competition of life, as is evidenced by the fact that only a very few isolated tribes still practice intragroup woman-capture.¹ To steal the women of other groups, however, has been a common practice and one often regarded as highly meritorious. Amongst primitive peoples any man might at any time capture and hold a woman, if he could. "He did it by superior force which was its own supreme justification."² The despoiled tribe might retaliate, the two groups thus being brought to war. The stealing of women is not always an individual enterprise; whole tribes may wage war with this object in mind.

The custom of securing wives by capture is widespread. Lubbock³ found that it prevailed in Australia and among the Malays; in Hindustan, Central Asia, Siberia, and Kamchatka; among the Eskimos, the North American Indians, and the aborigines of Brazil; in Chile and Tierra del Fuego; in the Philippines; among the Arabs and Negroes; in Circassia; and, until recently, throughout a large part of Europe. Westermarck⁴ cites scores of cases from which it appears that marriage by capture is chiefly found "either as an incident of war or as a method of procuring a wife when it is difficult or inconvenient to get one in the ordinary manner." In many cases it is a preliminary to marriage rather than a mode of contracting it.⁵ It is not maintained here that wife-capture is ever a normal mode of marriage; nevertheless it is a common phenomenon in culture history and one provocative of intergroup conflict.

Letourneau⁶ holds that the chief interest served by the capture of women from other tribes is the gratification of sex passion. This, however, is quite secondary to the economic motive. Primitive man desires women mainly as workers or slaves. The more women he has to labor for him, the more secure is his position in the struggle for existence. They are an economic asset for the work they do and the children they bear. Marriage among primitive peoples is primarily an economic affair. Wives are often property, purchased as such, and marriage is affected by property considerations in a variety of other ways.⁷ But for the added factors of children and the sex mores, marriage might well be classified under self-maintenance.⁸ Especially is the economic aspect of marriage visible in the division of labor by sex. Here the wife has many disagreeable tasks to perform, and, wherever an element of compulsion is necessary, this can be more easily exercised in the case of a captured woman. Moreover, to steal a wife is cheaper than to buy one. The capture of women has developed not so much by a rational and deliberate weighing of its advantages as by an automatic and unconscious adaptation in the folkways and mores. Men merely follow their impulses to satisfy their needs, looking no farther than immediate satisfaction. "From recurrent needs arise habits for the individual and customs for the group, but these results are consequences which were never conscious, and never foreseen or intended. They are not noticed until they have long existed, and it is still longer before they are appreciated."⁹

When wife-capture is embedded in the mores of primitive peoples, it becomes a fertile cause of war. It incites aggression, which is met by resistance and retaliation. Another source of friction is adultery, regarded by primitive peoples as an offense against the husband's property.¹⁰ In the in-group it may be compensated by a property fine, but where the offender is of another group it often leads to war. Intertribal conflict may similarly arise over elopement. War over women, whether due to capture, elopement, or adultery, is, therefore, only a special form of war over property, as the following cases will show.

Among the Dinkas of Africa, "a wife is obtained by purchase, the

price being paid in cattle; or by capture from hostile clans or tribes. The wives obtained in the latter way are inferior in position to the purchased wives."¹¹ They have more work to do. The Baganda also secure their wives in these two ways, capture is a mode of marriage in Ukambani, and throughout Nyassaland raids are made for slave women whom the conquerors marry.¹² Among the Ba-Huana, women constitute one of the chief causes of war, and the frequent wars of the Ba-Yaka arise principally from charges of adultery.¹³ It has been said of the Boloki that "ninety per cent of their quarrels were about women, for every man who had one or more wives bitterly resented any interference with his sole proprietorship in them."¹⁴ Almost all the quarrels of the Nigerian tribes are over women, and the capture of women is one of the chief causes of war.¹⁵ Among the Fang, "the chief causes of war are disputes over women and these feuds may last for years. Owing to a bitter feud it is often impossible for the women to work in the gardens or fish on the river, the consequence being a great scarcity of food." This situation is due to the fact that the Fang make no distinction of sex in their fights, shooting down women as well as men. Bennett,¹⁶ who reports the above facts, says that in Foulabifong, where he resided, "a woman palaver [dispute] lasted over ten months, and the three adjoining towns were in a state of famine"—a clear demonstration of the economic importance of women.

Among the independent tribes of the East Indies women were taken prisoners in war and sold from master to master. "The origin of this custom was the want of women."¹⁷ In Borneo, women are reckoned among the causes of war,¹⁸ and in New Guinea this is true in even greater measure.¹⁹ The Elema of Southeast New Guinea stole Motu women whenever the opportunity offered.²⁰ In the Dutch Protectorate adultery and rape often led to war between villages; the husband would wreak his revenge on any man of the seducer's village, and war would immediately ensue.²¹ In British New Guinea most of the feuds were connected with disputes over women, and in former Kaiser-Wilhelmsland the abduction of a woman usually led to hostilities.²²

The natives of the Shortland Islands and of Bougainville coast, Solomon Islands, continually waged war for women.²³ Among the Fijians, women were second in importance among the causes of war.²⁴ "Squabbles about women" were a chief cause of war in New Zealand; another was land. Hence the Maori proverb: "Land and women are the roots of war."²⁵ In other parts of Polynesia wars were frequently caused by adultery, breach of promise of marriage, and marriages between members of hostile tribes.²⁶

Nearly all the native fights in Australia are over women. The abduction of women, rape, elopement, and the refusal to surrender a girl promised in marriage are the commonest causes.²⁷ In Central Australia intertribal quarrels arise chiefly from wife-stealing, although not infrequently the elopement of a woman with a man of another group is a cause of serious trouble between the two groups.²⁸ The stealing of women is a common cause of war among the tribes of Cape River, and peace is arranged by the surrender of nets and women by the weaker party. In the York district, "quarrels generally originate in disputes concerning the women, the natural consequences of polygamy."²⁹ In Victoria, "the women almost invariably are the cause of quarrels and fights." Abduction of women and girls, even from the whites, was frequent, and misconduct on the part of the women also occasioned fights among the aborigines.³⁰ Among the tribes of Southeast Australia, "nearly all their fights were the result of the capture of women," and raids were often made for that special object.³¹ The same was true of the Kurnai, who stole women from kindred clans or captured them from alien tribes.³²

Marriage by capture formerly prevailed in Central India, and until recently the Thârn of the lower Himalayas obtained their brides by capture from other tribes.³³ The Yakuts once captured their wives from other tribes. In their legends and traditions the stealing of women is presented as a prime cause of war. Once a war captive, the Yakut wife is now a purchased slave, possessing no civil rights. When captured she was regarded as booty, and the wedding resembled the conclusion of a peace treaty. Even today, with wife-purchase, the wedding reveals many survivals of the former practice of wife-capture.³⁴

The Greenlanders, who have no war, nevertheless occasionally quarrel among themselves, and "women and love are among the most frequent causes of bloodshed."³⁵ The Chinook Indians were likewise peaceably inclined, but were frequently involved in quarrels resulting, it is said, "from the abduction of women more frequently than from other causes." Of the Northern Californians, Bancroft³⁶ also says: "The *casus belli* was usually that which brought the Spartan King before the walls of Ilion, and Titus Tatius to incipient Rome—woman. It is true, the Northern Californians were less classic abductors than the spoilers of the Sabine women, but their wars ended in the same manner—the ravished fair cleaving to her warrior-lover." Among the Central Californians likewise the abduction of women was the usual cause of war. The elopement of women often led to war among the Omahas. The Indians of Virginia, the Algonquins, and the Choctaws waged

war to secure women as slaves.⁸⁷ In South America, the Záparos, among others, seized the women and children of their enemies as servants or to sell, and the predatory Mbayas made war on other tribes to get women as wives.⁸⁸

Among more advanced peoples, the Trojan War and the Rape of the Sabine Maidens are classic examples of women as a cause of war. Marriage by capture and wars for female slaves were common in antiquity. To the Homeric Greeks, as we have already seen, human booty was one of the greatest incentives to war. It consisted chiefly of women and children, for organization was not yet strong enough to hold in subjection bodies of grown men. The female captives were put to work at feminine tasks. They were generally concubines, and were entirely at the disposal of their conquerors, who might marry them if they chose.⁸⁹ Many of the wars of the ancient Arabs were waged for the express purpose of capturing women; "sometimes all the women of a settlement were surprised in their men's absence, and many stories show that a chief point of strategy was to save the women and children." Frequently the captured women were taken to the slave market at Mecca and sold out of the country; quite commonly, however, they become the wives or mistresses of their captors. Marriage by capture was extremely prevalent, even as late as the time of Mohammed, who expressly recognized it, though he sought to modify some of its more offensive features.⁴⁰

Wife-capture likewise prevailed among the ancient Hebrews. "The husband is master," says Hastings,⁴¹ "supreme over his wives, who are slaves acquired by capture in war, or by purchase." A regular practice in their wars was to carry off the women and children of the enemy along with other movables, and at times to sell them to others.⁴² After the performance of a certain ritual, the captive maiden might be taken to wife.⁴³ In ancient Egypt, women and children were a valuable booty of war; they were captured and reduced to servitude.⁴⁴

The ancient Aryan peoples obtained wives by capture.⁴⁵ Even in modern times, in High Albania, though marriage is by purchase, girls are occasionally captured and even sold to the Moslems; and Yezidi women, who are much esteemed for their beauty,

have often been carried off by force for Moslem harems.⁴⁶ In the United States today, among the Italian immigrants, it is not unusual for a man to seize a girl "by force, either carrying her off himself or getting his friends to kidnap her and bring her to some secret place."⁴⁷

The prevalence of capture as an early means of obtaining wives is further seen in many survivals in the marriage ceremonies of different peoples. These are known as mock capture, for instead of actually capturing a wife, the man goes through the pretense of so doing, although the whole matter is arranged by both parties beforehand. Mock capture is a peaceful marriage form, developed, in many cases at least, from forcible capture, which usually entailed war.⁴⁸ It probably represents a case of the stress toward peace.⁴⁹

Women may be a cause of war, not merely as the passive objects of capture, abduction, and the like, but also as active instigators. When war is in the mores, when warlike qualities are approved and admired in the men, the women strengthen the mores by glorifying such qualities. By means of ridicule and approbation they exercise a large measure of social control in primitive societies. Westermarck⁵⁰ is of the opinion that women "instinctively prefer strong and brave men to feeble and cowardly ones." While questioning his premise, we may accept the fact and the cases he cites. Certainly women often encourage a warlike spirit. The women in Borneo are said decidedly to prefer men whose bravery and deeds of arms are notorious, and this accounts in large measure for the addiction of the people to war; the women urge the men on to martial exploits.⁵¹ Among the Kiwai Papuans the women even accompany the men on the warpath, inciting them to greater effort.⁵² The same is said of the Apache women.⁵³ In Australia the gins encourage the men to fight by taunting them and even beginning the battle themselves.⁵⁴ Among the Ba-Huana of the Congo, "the chief instigators of war are the women; if the men are peaceably inclined and rather disposed to pocket an insult, the women make fun of them: 'You are afraid, you are not men, we will have no more intercourse with you! *Woma, woma* (afraid)! Hu! Hu! Hu!' Then out go the men and fight."⁵⁵

War has had a significant influence on marriage and the relation of the sexes. Through wife-capture, it gave man a stronger position and aided in the dissolution of the mother-family⁵⁶ and its replacement by the father-family, a change which Sumner⁵⁷ regards as one of the greatest and most revolutionary in the history of civilization. The practice of wife-capture seems also to have promoted exogamy, or marrying outside the group, and thus to have aided in suppressing endogamy.⁵⁸ The social advantages of exogamy give it survival value. It involves outbreeding socially as well as biologically; it brings in not only new blood but also new mores; it leads to the "cross-fertilization of cultures."⁵⁹ Captured women bring with them the mores of their groups, promote the interchange of ideas and methods, and provide a larger field for the play of selection.⁶⁰ This is all the more significant when it is remembered that many of the industrial arts are in the hands of women, so that their capture spreads this knowledge from tribe to tribe.⁶¹ A disproportion between the sexes has also resulted from the capture of large numbers of enemy women, as particularly among the Hebrews and Egyptians,⁶² and from the greater mortality of the males in war. This has had its effect on the forms of marriage. It would seem, for example, that war has in this way been especially favorable to the development of polygyny.⁶³

CHAPTER VIII

RELIGION AS A CAUSE OF WAR

RELIGION has at all times led quite as much to war as to peace, and in primitive societies it exercises a stronger influence toward the former than toward the latter.¹ The religion of primitive man gives him numerous motives for slaying his enemy, and it allows but little of compromise or mitigation. Religious motives for war usually take the form of divine commands or precepts. These must be followed out to the bitter end; there can be no deviation, lest the gods be angry and bring dire misfortune. Among civilized men, perhaps the fiercest and most persistent of wars have been those waged on account of differences of religion. The religious wars of savages, though waged for other reasons, are just as cruel and relentless. To understand the motives behind them, some idea of the nature of primitive religion is necessary.

To primitive men the world is peopled with countless ghosts and spirits, which constitute a sort of imaginary environment. Many of them are the spirits of the dead, for primitive peoples universally believe that every man has a soul or double which can live outside the body.² The soul is the exact counterpart of the man, though incorporeal and shadow-like. When death occurs, the soul is believed to have left the body, never to return. It lives on in the spirit world near at hand, and its manner of life is much the same as that of the living. It has the same character, wants, and desires, and takes the same interest in affairs on earth. Most of the ghosts and spirits are conceived as malignant and hostile, as ever ready to harm the living. Because of their invisibility and the powers ascribed to them, they are feared much more than animals and living men. It is this ghost-fear which especially characterizes the religion of savages, as Tylor, Spencer, Lippert, Sumner, and Keller have so effectively demonstrated.³ Other characteristics of primitive religion are a sense of the mysterious or extraordi-

nary, which Lowie⁴ stresses, and a notion of impersonal supernatural power—the *mana* of the Melanesians—which Goldenweiser⁵ emphasizes. “*Mana* itself is not an animal or human being, nor a ghost or spirit, it is just power, magical potency. Although impersonal *per se*, it manifests itself with equal facility through natural objects or beings, through man, spirits, or ghosts.”

Primitive people carry on a severe struggle for existence. They are, as it were, on the very verge of existence, and the least mishap may push them over. If the hunters catch no game, if the cattle become diseased or are stolen, if the men are defeated in war, or if any similar ill luck befall the group, its very existence is imperiled and it may perish. Bad luck or misfortune looms large in primitive life. It seems to outweigh all good luck or good fortune. Indeed the latter is taken for granted and only the former considered. This “aleatory element,” as it has been called,⁶ demands an explanation in order that man may adapt himself to it or offset its consequences. The explanation is found in the imaginary environment of ghosts and spirits. These are the cause of all happenings; they have power over the living and can effect their weal or woe. Having no conception of causality, of natural laws and forces, primitive peoples ascribe all phenomena which they cannot understand to the agency of spirits.⁷ Especially do they attribute the ills of life to supernatural powers, for the most part malignant. In order to escape misfortunes, therefore, they must appease the evil spirits—by sacrificing to them, by providing them with the things they desire, and in general by performing all the obligations which the cult or care of the spirits enjoins on them.⁸

The spirits are particularly anxious that the living keep up the old ways and customs. If their descendants deviate from the traditional folkways and mores, they become angry and show their displeasure by sending calamities of all kinds. Fear of the ghosts is thus a sanction to the mores; it assures their continuance. Herein lies one of the chief functions of religion in primitive society. Religion itself comes out of the mores, it sums up the most general elements in them—inculcating them as religious dogmas—and it forms precepts on them.⁹ Thus, whatever the mores may be, religion intensifies them; it asserts that they are the proper and

right ways and holds out punishments or rewards according as they are disobeyed or conformed to.

This function of religion has its effect on war. Religion has always intensified ethnocentrism and thus has hastened the conflicts to which ethnocentrism naturally leads. "The adherents of a religion always think themselves the chosen people or else they think that their god is superior to all others, which amounts to the same thing."¹⁰ By accentuating the differences between the mores of the in-group and those of other groups, religion inculcates the attitude of superiority and hostility and so promotes conflict and war. It nourishes sentiments of enmity and hatred by enjoining hostile acts and by promising reward for their performance. Thus, to be "good," a Haida Indian must go to war against an alien tribe; if he is killed, the medicine man will gain him admittance to heaven.¹¹ "The good are good warriors and hunters," said a Pawnee chief.¹² The rude Tupi-nambas of Brazil believed that only the souls of men who had lived virtuously, that is to say, had well avenged themselves and eaten many of their enemies, would go to the place of the blessed.¹³

Among the virtues taught by the religion of the natives of Savage Island were theft from another tribe and the slaughter of an enemy. The virtuous were better off in the next world.¹⁴ To please the Fijian gods, to be received after death in their paradise, it was necessary to be sufficiently steeped in crime. "Upon his arrival in the other world, the double of a Fiji islander should be able to boast with good reason of having killed many people and destroyed many villages: these were his good works. He must be worthy of the gods whom he rejoins in the next world, and who, for the majority, were the incarnation of diverse atrocities as is indicated clearly by their names: there were in fact among the divine personages, the Adulterer, the Nocturnal Ravisher of Rich Women, the Quarreller, the Bully, the Murderer, etc."¹⁵

Religion conduces to warlike prowess among the natives of Nigeria, since the strongest on earth will also be the strongest in the world to come.¹⁶ This and similar ideas arise from the conception that the soul is the exact counterpart of the physical man. Character and ability carry over from this world to the next. If a man

is a great warrior here, he will be a great warrior there and will receive the same distinction and prestige. Cowards and ordinary people, on the other hand, who are scorned here, will be equally despised in the other world. Hence to enjoy an enviable future life, it is well to be brave and warlike on earth. Thus religion promotes war and military virtues.

The Tangkhuls of Manipur believe that "if a man has been brave and courageous in this life, he is welcomed in the after-world by those who have gone before, but the coward is met with groans and jeers."¹⁷ The Angami have a future world; "at the entrance they are met by a door-keeper; should the soul be that of a man who has been a great warrior, hunter or snake-killer, then he is received courteously; if not, small notice is taken of him." The Luhupa have a similar belief; to assure that a warrior on his arrival in the next world may be recognized and received with distinctions, his nearest male relative takes a spear and wounds the corpse by a blow on the head.¹⁸ Among the Kuki-Lushai clans, the grandest title a man may attain is Thangchhuah, won by killing a man or some wild beast. It carries much honor in this world and the right to admission to Pial-ral or heaven after death.¹⁹

The future abode of spirits, among the Elema tribe of the Papuan Gulf, is determined by the kind of death the individuals die. The spirits and their future state are classified as follows: first those who have died fighting as warriors, then those who have died a natural death, those who have been murdered, and those who have been killed by crocodiles or snakes. The spirits of warriors are taken to the residence of the god of war, are allowed considerable liberty, and are generally better off than the rest.²⁰ The tribes of Torres Straits believe that the greatest warriors, the biggest skull-hunters, are better off in the future life than others who lack in these respects.²¹ In Santa Cruz and Reef Islands, those who die in battle turn into flying ghosts, which is held to be very desirable, while those who die of sickness are denied this privilege.²²

The Hervey Islanders have a nether-world called Avaiki, which is like a vast coconut shell, on the top of which are ten heavens constituting the elysium of the brave. The inevitable fate of cowards and all who die a natural death is for their spirits to be caught in a net and laved to and fro in a lake and then cooked and eaten by the mistress of Avaiki and her attendants. "But a nobler fate awaited warrior spirits, whether male or female. Their home was the warrior's paradise in the heavens. . . . These fortunate spirits look down with ineffable disgust

upon the wretches in Avaiki. They are covered with garlands of sweet-scented flowers, and spend their time in dancing the war dance and in reciting, over and over again, the brave deeds performed in life." "The inevitable result of this belief," says Gill,²³ our authority, "was to foster an utter contempt for violent death. Many anecdotes are related of aged warriors, scarcely able to hold a spear, insisting on being led to the field of battle, in the hope of gaining the home of the brave." In Bowditch Island it is believed that the king and important people go to the moon while the common people go to an inferior place.²⁴

Many American Indian tribes had similar beliefs. The Aztecs and Peruvians held that only war heroes went to the sun, the rest going to the underworld.²⁵ The Záparos of South America believed in metamorphosis, the valiant men into tigers, others into the animals most akin to their own characteristics.²⁶ The Caribs of the West Indies thought that their brave men would live after death in happy islands but that cowards would be relegated to the barren land beyond the mountains.²⁷

The ancient Scandinavians believed that those who fell in battle went to Odin in Walhalla, while the men of peace went down to dismal Hela.²⁸ The Mohammedans in general believe that those who die fighting will attain the enjoyment of paradise. The Wahábys, for instance, hold out this hope.²⁹ The Christians, too, in their holy wars, were urged on by the glimpse of paradise opening up to receive the slayer of the infidel.

Some of the above cases carry a suggestion of the military advantage of religion. It produces exaltation of feeling, which "makes men dare everything and do anything." There is truth in Carlyle's dictum that God-fearing armies are the best armies. Bagehot³⁰ holds in the case of Cromwell's famous exhortation, "Trust in God, and keep your powder dry," that the trust was of as much use as the powder, if not of more.

Closely related to the beliefs which give preference to warlike men in the next world are those which distinguish the fate which awaits the conquerors from that which befalls the conquered or subject people. The former generally go to the sun, moon, or sky, while the latter go down to an underworld. Such ideas have been held by the Caribs, the Aztecs, the Incas of Peru, the Persians, Egyptians, Indians, Chinese, and others. This distinction has led to two different cults, those of the rulers and of the subject peo-

ple—the origin, thinks Lippert,³¹ of the cults of light and of darkness, from which developed the idea of good and evil.

Religion further conduces to warlike prowess among primitive peoples by assuring them that all whom they kill in this world will serve them as slaves in the next. We are not here concerned with human sacrifice, though its relation to the present subject is obvious. Savages conceive of the other world as a replica of this. There everything is similar to, or perhaps a little better than, what is here. Hunters here will hunt there, though on “happy hunting-grounds.” Warriors here will be warriors there; hence the dead must be supplied with weapons, deposited in their graves.³² Chiefs in this world will be chiefs in the next, slaves will remain slaves, and so forth. Similarly, enemies defeated and slain in battle on earth will be subjected to their conquerors in the after life.

According to Tremearne,³³ the belief that the spirit of a slaughtered enemy will attend the slayer in the next world increases the warlike activity of the natives of Nigeria. The Boloki of the Congo have a similar belief, and the Baganda keep the skulls of their fallen enemies “to have some hold on the spirits of those slain in war that they might attend their conqueror in the spirit land.”³⁴ In like manner those killed by a Luhupa become his slaves in the next world. This tribe believes that on a certain night in the year the dead may be seen passing over the distant hills, driving before them slain men and stolen cattle.³⁵ According to the Idaan, “all whom they kill in this world shall attend them as slaves after death,” and Tylor³⁶ remarks that “this notion of future interest in the destruction of the human species is a great impediment to an intercourse with them, as murder goes farther than present advantage or resentment.” The Caribs, who lived in a state of mutual hostility and enslavement with the Arawaks, believed that their brave men after death would have Arawaks as their slaves, while their cowards would serve the Arawaks in that capacity.³⁷ The same general idea plays an important part in the beliefs of head-hunting tribes and will later be seen to be a motive in that practice.

Since warriors are greatly esteemed while living and especially distinguished after death, it is but natural that they should receive an appropriate burial, something different from and superior to the funerals of ordinary people. Thus the Masai will bury a chief, but will throw the bodies of lesser people to the hyenas.

Similar notions prevail among many other African tribes. Some give elaborate burial with special ceremonies to both chiefs and warriors.³⁸ A few tribes enter the latter in a sitting position as a mark of rank.³⁹ The natives of Rotuma bury their chiefs on the highest hills.⁴⁰ The Sea Dyaks roof, curtain, and decorate with streamers the grave of a warrior, and palisade the ground around.⁴¹ In India and Assam, similar distinctions are shown in various ways, such as preserving the corpse in oil or smoking it dry, cremating it or giving it special burial.⁴² Civilized peoples magnify their military and naval heroes by erecting splendid tombs or mausoleums in their honor.

Sometimes warriors and chiefs receive special burial for another reason—because they have died a violent death. Some primitive peoples believe that if a man's body be wounded or mutilated, his soul will arrive in a similar condition in the other world.⁴³ Like the body, the soul is conceived as being injured by a violent death, and the living fear that it will harbor revenge. It is for this reason that the tribes of Nyassaland "have a horror of a body that has died a violent death" and will not touch a man who has been killed in battle.⁴⁴ One tribe in British Central Africa will not take such a body home, but bury it on the warpath, and certain tribes in East Africa, Mexico, and elsewhere leave slain warriors on the battlefield to be devoured by wild beasts.⁴⁵ The natives of Manipur and of Timorlaut, on the other hand, give a special burial to those who die a violent death, but the latter people, in the case of a man who has lost his head in war, place a coconut in the grave to represent the missing member and thus deceive the spirits.⁴⁶

The burial places of chiefs and renowned warriors often become places of worship. They are sacred because they contain the souls of the dead, and especially revered because the dead were particularly illustrious. Spencer⁴⁷ has traced the origin and development of temples from the grave and the specially provided house for the dead. Among some tribes in Africa old chiefs and ancestors are buried in the holy groves, and their graves become places of worship. In every Yao village there is a shrine which is the center of worship of the inhabitants. Such shrines mark the graves of most Yao chiefs or headmen and are regarded as the abodes of their

souls. Often they are erected on the spots where the chiefs died in war. Only the graves of such men are treated as shrines of worship.⁴⁸ In Imphal, Manipur, are two trees beneath which lie the tribesmen who have fallen in battle; hence they stand on sacred ground, and no man of the tribe dares to walk between them.⁴⁹

The honoring of warriors reaches its climax in their apotheosis—the phase of religion known as hero worship. Great warriors are the most likely to be long remembered. They are the most respected while alive and when dead are regarded with even greater reverence and fear. Moreover, they are usually the chiefs and headmen, and, since the spirits of the departed retain their former stations, their spirits are of greater account than those of ordinary men. Tradition preserves their memory as spirits ranking high above ordinary ancestors and controlling the destiny and prosperity of the people. Thus they slide gradually into the rank of gods.

The worship of departed chiefs, especially of very ancient ones, as gods is practically universal among the Bantu tribes of East Central Africa.⁵⁰ The natives of British Central Africa believe that chiefs continue to hold a directing influence on the well-being of the tribe; they therefore worship them and ask their intercession before setting out to battle.⁵¹ The Tshi-speaking peoples of West Africa appeal to their deceased chiefs for advice and assistance; those longest dead have been deified.⁵² Quite recently, a chief of the Upper Congo region, “a man of war, a cruel warrior who held life cheap” and terrorized all the neighborhood, was regarded as a great spirit when he died.⁵³ Ideas of transmigration are sometimes associated with the deification of chiefs. The Zulus, for instance, believe that the spirits of their kings after death inhabit a deadly snake.⁵⁴ The Bahima think that the ghosts of kings become lions, while the spirits of dead princes enter snakes; the lions regarded as the reincarnations of former kings are guarded and fed by special priests.⁵⁵

Famous chiefs are often apotheosized in Melanesia. In Florida and others of the Solomon Islands certain gods are the spirits of famous fighting men and are resorted to by the people for aid in war.⁵⁶ The gods of the Fijians were “chiefs of the blood royal who had been masterful and oppressive in life.”⁵⁷ Similarly, in Brazil, warlike braves were regarded after death as heroes and were later deified.⁵⁸ The same

notions were held by the natives of Chile,⁵⁹ and the North American Indians likewise had hero gods.⁶⁰

Apotheosized warriors and chiefs usually become war gods, though it cannot be said that all gods of war have originated in this way. The important matter here is not the question of their origin, but their effect—or rather the effect of belief in them—on war. War gods are often the chief gods, as is but natural in view of the generally warlike character of primitive peoples. The gods of any people reflect its character, and warlike peoples have more concern with warlike gods. The primary purpose of the cult is to secure divine aid in all important undertakings. War is one of the most critical events in the life of primitive man, and one in which he has great need of divine intercession, especially since the “aleatory element” is so strongly involved. Hence the god he is most interested in—at least when war prevails—is the god of battles, the war god, and this divinity he exalts above all others.⁶¹

War gods are invariably depicted as bellicose, terrible, and bloodthirsty. They demand human victims; hence war is waged to satisfy them: they delight in war; hence hostilities are begun for their pleasure. In these and other ways they incite to war, and they honor in after life those who have excelled in military prowess on earth.

Fuan-Fuan-fo is the war god of Moree, West Africa. “He is of human shape but monstrous in size, and very black. He is always represented as carrying in his left hand a flint-lock musket, and in his right a whip, with which he drives his people into the van of battle. Formerly captives taken in war were sacrificed to him . . . for it was believed that if he were not propitiated with a human victim, he would turn against the people of Moree.” The war god of the Dahomans is Bo, the special guardian of warriors. Since Dahomey is a military kingdom, Bo is worshiped more than any other god. The chief deity of the Yorubas is Obatala, who is represented as mounted on a horse and armed with a spear. These people also have a special god of war and iron, Ogun, to whom a slave is sacrificed in time of war.⁶² The Tangale have several gods, the chief one being the god of war who sends them many travelers to kill.⁶³ Kazoba is the war god of the Bahima; to him they pray when in distress, but in times of peace he is not invoked and for all practical purposes might be non-existent. The Bahima are relatively peaceful,

and this perhaps accounts for the slight importance of their war god. The warlike Baganda have greater need of a god of war. As a matter of fact, they have two: Nende, who goes to war on all expeditions to the north, and Kibuka, who goes on all expeditions to the west. The former has two priests, the latter five. These war gods even take direct part in battle.⁶⁴ The Akikuyu of British East Africa have three gods, two of whom are associated with their chief industries, cattle raising and cattle lifting. One sends riches, such as cattle, and to him supplication and sacrifice are made before battle; the second is thought to cause the loss of live stock by death or war.⁶⁵

The Khonds of India consider wars to be the act and will of their war god, Loha Pennu. "Whenever fevers or tigers rage or ravage it is accepted as a hint from Loha Pennu that his service has been too long neglected." This war god, "who entered into all weapons, so that from instruments of peace they became weapons of war, who gave edge to the axe and point to the arrow," is the very personification of tribal war.⁶⁶ The war god of the Sea Dyaks ranks first; next to him is a god who provides heads in war. In Sarawak generally, the god of war is exalted above all others by the importance ascribed by the natives to that department of human activity. The chief interest of the people is war, and their very existence depends upon success in battle; hence the god of battles has come to dominate all others and to claim the almost exclusive regard of his worshipers.⁶⁷ Samoa also has its god of war,⁶⁸ and in the Marshall Islands nothing is so relished by the gods as war, and nothing gives occasion for larger sacrifices.⁶⁹

In the New World war gods were exalted to the highest rank. The Canadian Indians prayed to the Great Spirit before battle. The great celestial deity of the Iroquois was Areskove, the war god. "For his pleasant food they slaughtered human victims, that he might give them victory over their enemies; as a pleasant sight for him they tortured the war-captives; on him the war-chief called in solemn council, and the warriors, shouting his name, rushed into the battle he was surveying from on high."⁷⁰ The thunder-god was the Omaha war deity. To him every youth and warrior was consecrated. He was the chief god and was addressed as "grandfather," the term of highest respect in their language.⁷¹ A similar situation prevailed among the Dakotas, for every man was formally and mysteriously enlisted into the service of the war prophet, who served the god of war.⁷² The Florida Indians prayed to their chief god, the Sun, before battle. The very name of Mexico seems to be derived from Mexitli, the national war god, identified with Huitzilopochtli, who demanded human victims, the primary

object of Aztec warfare.⁷³ The natives of Chile worshiped Pillan, the god of war and thunder, into whom in some unexplained way chiefs and warriors who fell in battle were merged.⁷⁴ The Mbayas of Bolivia believed that their deity, the Great Eagle, had bidden them live by making war on all other tribes.⁷⁵

Peoples on a higher stage of civilization have also had their war gods. In the ancient militant societies of the East, the gods were habitually represented as conquerors. Their names were usually "the destroyer," "the avenger," "god of battles," "lord of hosts," and so forth. By their alleged will, the Assyrians commenced wars, and in professed obedience to them people were massacred wholesale.⁷⁶ The god of the Hebrews was a god of war, who ordered civil as well as foreign wars. He encouraged wars of extermination, such as that in which Joshua "utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord God of Israel commanded."⁷⁷ The greatest of the Buddhist personal gods is the Enemy-defeating god, a sort of Hercules. Resembling him in many ways is the war god of the Chinese, an apotheosized hero, Kwan-te or Kuang Tā, who in life was a distinguished officer during the wars of the Han dynasty. Emperors since his time have delighted to honor him by adding to his usual title more and more honorary distinctions.⁷⁸ The Buddhist gods of Tibet wage war even among themselves, and the war god directs the divine army.⁷⁹ Booty wars and piracy among the Homeric Greeks were presided over by Athena and Zeus; the warlike functions of Ares and Mars are a matter of common knowledge.⁸⁰ Among the Norse, the cult of Odin was vitally concerned with military matters, though the cult of Thor was also prominent in time of war.⁸¹

The worship of war gods promotes war by keeping warlike qualities ever before the people and by promising them prosperity in this life and better treatment in the next. It causes war directly, when it is believed that the gods like war and command it. Their wishes and desires are generally made known to the people through the medium of priests or war prophets, who often incite the people to war by declaring that the gods demand sacrifices, revenge, or what not.⁸²

The foregoing cases show religion as a general cause of war,

sanctioning and intensifying the warlike propensities of primitive men. It also promotes war in several specific ways. One of these is through violations of taboos. A taboo may be regarded as a negative expression of the mores, a prohibition carrying a heavy religious penalty. Violations of taboos were a frequent cause of war in the Fiji Islands,⁸³ throughout Polynesia,⁸⁴ in parts of Africa,⁸⁵ and elsewhere. Captain Cook was killed by the natives of Sandwich Islands because he violated one of their taboos. Some natives stole one of his boats, and he, to recover it, tried to seize the king's person until reparation should be made. The natives resisted, for the king's person was sacred and taboo; an affray ensued, and Captain Cook was killed.⁸⁶

In New Zealand, curses were among the provocations to war—a religious cause, for among uncivilized peoples curses are thought to exist, as it were, by themselves, to have actual spiritual power to bring about the desired effect.⁸⁷ Another religious cause of hostilities, found in Polynesia, is alleged insult or injury to the dead of another group.⁸⁸ This is an offense to the group's ancestral spirits and, unless punished, will bring down their wrath. A similar cause is the mentioning of the name of a deceased person during the period of mourning. The West Victoria aborigines, for instance, consider this an insult to the deceased, and frequently resort to arms to avenge it.⁸⁹ To speak evil of another totem, or to mimic it, is regarded by the Euahlayi of Australia as a serious offense; it causes trouble immediately.⁹⁰

A more common source of hostility is the belief in magic and witchcraft, found among most primitive peoples. Both ideas go back to the notion that the spirits are the cause or agency of all phenomena. To the savage the conception of natural law is totally wanting; he ascribes every happening to the agency of spirits—some benevolent, most of them hostile. The spirits are generally superior to man and must be propitiated; some of them, however, can be coerced to do man's will. If a person wishes to injure or kill an enemy, he can accomplish his design most effectively by making use of some spirit over which he has control, or over which people think he has control. Thus magic and witchcraft are fundamentally based on the idea that harm may be wrought by one man

upon another through a spiritual agency. It is possible, for example, by divers means to obtain power over the soul of another man and thus to injure him.⁹¹ Indeed, a man may have power to injure others by spiritual means without being cognizant of the fact, as in the case of the evil eye. In magic, witchcraft, and other phases of primitive religion the important fact is not whether there is any truth behind the beliefs, but whether the people believe in them. As Lippert⁹² very discerningly has said, the power of an idea depends not on the truth inherent in it, but on its vividness and the extent of its diffusion. This statement is borne out by many facts. We know that witchcraft and magic are in fact imaginary, yet primitive peoples believe implicitly in them and act accordingly, and their acts frequently lead to war and bloodshed.

The Motu of southeast New Guinea have a superstitious fear of the neighboring Koitapu, to the magical power of whom they attribute any calamity befalling them. In 1876 they lost much of their sago in a storm at sea, their frail canoes being unable to withstand the rough water and carry the cargo. They charged the Koitapu with bewitching their canoes and killed many of them in revenge. Again, in 1878, after a prolonged drought, for which they held a Koitapu village responsible, they attacked the village and killed all they could. "As the drought had long continued, rain soon followed this murder and confirmed the natives in their superstitious belief."⁹³ Another instance, illustrative of the mental reactions of primitive man, is furnished by the Quissama of Angola. Should a traveler pass through their country during a prosperous season, they look upon him as a fetish, or possessed of a spirit, but should a dearth occur, he had better escape as quickly as possible, for he is blamed for it and severely handled.⁹⁴ In the Solomon Islands and the New Hebrides, belief in the evil eye is said to be one of the most frequent causes of war.⁹⁵

The belief in the ability to cause sickness and death by magic and witchcraft is a more frequent and serious cause of war. This belief is extremely widespread among primitive peoples, who generally have no conception of death as a natural phenomenon but regard it as caused by magic, incantations, witchcraft, and the like.⁹⁶ The consequence is that when a man sickens or dies, some-

one else is charged with having been the cause. The tribes of Assam, for instance, hold that sickness and death are caused by an evil spirit projected by some member of a hostile tribe.⁹⁷ The supposed magician or witch is commonly put to death. If he is a member of another tribe, war between the two groups may result. How serious are the consequences of this belief may be seen from Miss Kingsley's⁹⁸ statement that "the belief in witchcraft is the cause of more African deaths than anything else. It has killed and still kills more men and women than the slave-trade." It is no uncommon thing in Africa for ten or more persons to be killed for the sickness or death of one.

Belief in witchcraft is a fruitful source of war in Polynesia.⁹⁹ It leads to similar results in New Guinea. Not long ago part of the Toaripi tribe left Eavara to settle nearer the coast. Soon after the settlement was formed, a large number of tribesmen developed a bad form of ulcerated legs. It was decided that they were the victims of sorcerers, who were supposed to be members of the faction which had opposed leaving Eavara. A quarrel ensued and developed into a tribal fight.¹⁰⁰ The Kiwai Papuans are frequently incited to war by similar beliefs. About 1890, for example, a party of Sumai natives went to Domori where they were treated hospitably, but shortly after their return home one of the leaders of the party became ill and died. His spirit, it was held, appeared and reported that a certain Domori man was the cause of his death. His tribesmen thereupon attacked Domori and killed several of its inhabitants.¹⁰¹ These two instances, the Quissama case, and many others illustrate clearly how the savage mind functions: *post hoc ergo propter hoc*.

In Australia, belief in magic and witchcraft is a source of never-ending hostility and bloodshed. Every death is ascribed to these two influences, and the supposed sorcerer is straightway killed. Spencer and Gillen¹⁰² say that under normal conditions in Central Australia every death means the killing of another individual. If the alleged sorcerer is a member of some other tribe, an avenging party starts out and war ensues. Curr¹⁰³ says of the Australians in general that the belief in sorcery by an alien tribesman as the cause of death is by far the most common and most serious cause of war. To this belief is due in part the hostile feeling which the Australians entertain toward all out-

siders and strangers. They believe that all strangers are in league to take their lives by sorcery, and "the result of this belief is that, wherever they can, the Blacks in their wild state never neglect to massacre all male strangers who fall into their power."

It is held in West Victoria that death is caused only by magic. The dying person or the medicine-man indicates the persons, usually in an alien tribe, responsible for the death. An avenging party sets out to kill the suspected persons. The avengers themselves are then killed in retaliation, and a feud commences. The result of this belief is a constant destruction of life.¹⁰⁴ Throughout Victoria, even when a man dies a lingering natural death, someone is charged with the crime and an attempt is made to avenge it. The sorcerer is generally a member of another tribe, and vengeance may be obtained by killing any member of his tribe, if he himself cannot be found. If a man becomes sick, his friends at once conclude that his sickness is caused by the evil practices of his enemies. Suspicion is created, hints are given by wary old black-fellows who have old grudges unsatisfied, and at length some tribe is fixed upon, and a combat ensues.¹⁰⁵

Religion has been a cause of war for similar reasons in the Americas. The northern Californians, for instance, believed that death was caused by magic, and war frequently resulted as a consequence of this conviction. More than once these natives have taken up arms because of "wicked sorceries which caused the death of the people."¹⁰⁶ If any one of the Záparo Indians in South America dies or falls ill from natural causes, "his death or illness is almost sure to be attributed to sorceries exercised upon his person by some secret or open enemy, and his friends often take revenge accordingly." This forms the basis of most of their disagreements and quarrels.¹⁰⁷ With the Araucanians of Chile, "the direct cause of illness is supposed to be either an invisible wound or some extraneous substance introduced into the body of the patient." The witchdoctor is called in to effect a cure. If the patient dies, the blame is generally cast on some evil spirit but is sometimes imputed to an individual against whom the exorcist has a grudge or else to a known enemy of the deceased or his family. In such a case a hunt is made for the guilty party; if caught he is burnt alive. "This led to reprisals on the part of the relatives [of the victim], and was a frequent cause of intertribal warfare."¹⁰⁸

Primitive peoples, as was said earlier, do not fight on account of religious differences; that was reserved for civilized men, the Crusaders for instance. A case somewhat to the contrary is pre-

sented by the natives of Rotuma. They never used to wage war on account of different religious beliefs, but since the island has become Christianized they have taken up that practice. Now there are religious wars between Christian and heathen, between Wesleyan and Roman Catholic, and so forth.¹⁰⁹ The natives here have merely adopted the civilized man's mores, whereas in their unaffected state such wars were totally unknown. Another instance which might appear to be an exception is that of the ancient Peruvians. Their wars were crusades, wars of proselytism; they endeavored to propagate the worship of the sun. They began first with persuasion; if that was not accepted they declared war upon their neighbors who refused their doctrine. They are even said—perhaps with exaggeration—to have had no other motive for conquest and to have exacted from the conquered nothing more than submission to their will.¹¹⁰ But it must be remembered that the ancient Peruvians were a highly civilized race, being in some respects as far advanced as Europeans until very recent times.

In general, therefore, only advanced peoples wage war on account of religious differences. The Mohammedans present the classic example. It is well known what activity they displayed, after the death of their prophet, in an attempt to subjugate and evangelize the world. Thus the Moors extended their conquests to northern Africa, Spain, and other countries in southern Europe; the Saracens made themselves masters of the places held sacred by the early Christian Church; and the Arabs and Persians pushed on to various parts of Central Asia, India, Indonesia, and Africa.¹¹¹ The Wahábys possess an Islamic religion which prescribes continual war against all who have not adopted their reformed doctrine. Their expeditions have been chiefly directed toward their northern neighbors, from Basra, along the Euphrates, to Syria. "In propagating their creed, the Wahábys have established it as a fundamental rule to kill all their enemies found in arms. . . . It is this practice (imitated from the first propagators of Islam) which makes the Waháby name so dreaded. During their four years' warfare with the soldiers of Mohammed Aly Pasha, not a single instance is recorded of their having given quarter to a Turk."¹¹² The Mohammedans differ, however, only in

the matter of degree from other civilized peoples who have tried to spread their faith. The evangelization of the world has usually been undertaken by the sword. The history of the Jesuits and the Portuguese and Spanish generally in South America reeks with cruelties and barbarities committed in the zeal of religious faith. The atrocities they committed against the natives far surpassed any that the worst of the savages ever perpetrated on one another.¹¹³

Although primitive peoples do not wage such religious wars, they nevertheless fight very often for religious reasons. Only the general aspects of this topic have been treated above. Below there will be presented three special religious causes of war, namely, blood revenge, human sacrifice, and head-hunting.

CHAPTER IX

BLOOD REVENGE

IN-GROUP murder has always and everywhere, so far as we know, been considered a punishable offense. Its prohibition is the primary taboo amongst all peoples. The injunction, Thou shalt not kill [a member of the in-group], is the first prerequisite to group life. Without its restraining influence, life would be insecure, social solidarity would be impaired, and the group would succumb in its encounters with other groups. Consequently the murder of a fellow tribesman is a heinous offense, and its punishment is proportionate to the crime.

In civilized societies murder is dealt with by the state, but this is not the case in primitive groups. They have no developed system of law, no judges or tribunals for the punishment of crime, yet they generally live together in peace and security. What in their case takes the place of civilized judicial procedure? The answer is found in the practice of personal justice or private revenge. All wrongs affecting the individual are considered private matters; they are for him or his relatives to redress. As Lubbock¹ has said, "among the lower races of men, the chiefs scarcely take any cognisance of offences, unless they relate to such things as directly concern, or are supposed to concern, the interests of the community generally. As regards private injuries, every one must protect or avenge himself."

While murder in civilized communities is a secular matter and is punished by the state, with primitive peoples it is inextricably bound up with their religious beliefs. With them the punishment of murder is a religious duty, traceable to the primitive notions concerning the soul and the after life. When a man dies his soul lives on. The mode of life in the spirit world is much like that on earth, but the dead man has greater power for he is more difficult to deal with. Ghosts are feared, and ghost-fear is the basis of primitive religion. The wishes and commands of the dead are en-

forced by this fear. The spirits have rights; the living, duties. The penalty for failure to execute the desires and commands of the spirits is to incur their wrath and bring down incalculable calamity and misfortune. The dead carry into the next world the feelings and desires with which they left this. The ghost of a murdered man is, therefore, certain to be angry, for it has suffered the greatest possible injury. It will not rest until its murder has been avenged.

The obligation of vengeance falls upon the surviving blood relatives, in particular the nearest male kin. Among primitive peoples the fundamental relationship is that of blood.² All the members of a group are united by the bond of blood; they are thought to possess the same blood, a fiction still held by some people today.³ Blood kinship is the basis of the peace-group. Outsiders are strangers, *Blutfremde* or blood aliens, with whom peaceful relations are impossible so long as unity of blood is the only known bond.⁴ Blood relationship involves the duty of blood revenge, the injunction to avenge by death the murder of one's blood relatives, even their death in battle.

If the survivors fail in their duty, the enraged ghost will haunt them all their lives. Ghost-fear, transcending all other forms of fear, assures the fulfilment of this obligation. Blood revenge, therefore, is fundamentally a form of propitiating the ghost or soul of the departed. It is from fear of the angry ghost that the crime of murder derives much of its horror in primitive society and that revenge is so persistently sought.⁵ Thus the duty of avenging the death of his nearest relatives is the most sacred and holy duty that a savage is called upon to perform, and he never neglects or forgets it.

Other motives enter to support and strengthen this obligation. It comes to be considered a point of honor; the murdered man's relatives think that their honor has been blackened and that the stain can only be cleansed by blood. Public opinion and the desire to stand well amongst one's fellows also enforce this duty. Should a man leave it unfulfilled, "the old women would taunt him; if he were unmarried, no girl would speak to him; if he had wives, they would leave him; his mother would cry and lament that she had

given birth to so degenerate a son, his father would treat him with contempt, and he would be a mark of public scorn."⁶ Blood revenge is set in motion not so much by murderous lust as by family affection.

These reasons for blood vengeance apply with particular force against members of the out-group. The need of standing together in the struggle for existence and the competition of life operates as a check within the group. Here blood vengeance, if unrestricted, would lead to social disintegration and the danger of extinction. Consequently means were early devised to limit and regulate it.⁷ It is, to be sure, occasionally found in an unmitigated form within the group, especially between different families or clans of a tribe, but usually only in cases where the competition of life is not severe. The slaying of an alien, on the other hand, is not socially disruptive. It is not regarded as murder; it may even be a laudable act. Hence blood revenge against out-group members is not so regularly subjected to social restraint.

Blood revenge becomes a group matter when the murderer and his victim are members of different groups, for it is widely held among primitive peoples that all the members of a group are responsible for the acts of any of its members.⁸ Vengeance may therefore be taken, not necessarily on the murderer himself, but on any of his fellows. The complement of this principle, and the natural consequence of group solidarity, is that every member of a tribe is as ready to take vengeance as the person principally injured. Thus what was originally a wrong to an individual becomes a wrong to a group and private vengeance develops into public war.

The law of blood vengeance is a fruitful source of feuds and warfare. It demands, with all the force of ghost-fear, that blood be shed for blood. In its unmitigated form it is absolutely rigid and inexorable. It makes no distinction between premeditated murder, accidental homicide, and slaying in self-defense. Death has occurred, and the only way of dealing with those responsible is by blood vengeance. When the murderer or one of his group is slain, the obligation of revenge is satisfied, but a new obligation is thereby incurred on the other side, and the avengers of the origi-

nal murder must now look to their own defense. Thus an endless chain of retaliation is started, one death demanding another, and blood revenge passes into a blood feud, which may last for years. The original offense is not often forgotten, for savages have good memories for injuries done them, and feuds may thus be passed on from generation to generation.⁹ If the next of kin fails to secure vengeance, his son or heir inherits the obligation as a holy duty, as the most important thing he must accomplish in life. A chief when dying may remind his people of a revenge still unexecuted, and such death orders are regarded as sacred commands. Since death is often believed to be caused by hostile magic or witchcraft, another motive than actual murder may call into play the law of blood vengeance. No tribe can tell when it may be charged with having killed by magic a member of another group. The avengers of such a supposed murder may burst upon it at any moment. Hence it lives in distrust and suspicion of all its neighbors. Thus a situation is created from which there seems no escape. Indeed, many savage tribes find themselves so involved in blood feuds and the resulting intertribal wars that they are totally unable to extricate themselves. The discovery of a way out of this dilemma, especially through the idea that blood revenge can be settled by compensation, by a property payment, is, as will be shown below, the grandest case of the mitigation of war.

The foregoing remarks are inductions from an examination of hundreds of cases, many of which are cited in Appendix H. Others, taken from more advanced peoples, are set forth herewith to illustrate the way in which the practice of blood vengeance works out into intertribal warfare in specific instances.

Blood vengeance prevailed among the Hebrews, where the law prescribed that "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death."¹⁰ Revenge was a duty of the whole family and was originally directed against the entire family of the slayer.¹¹ Accidental homicide, however, was distinguished from intentional homicide, and the avenger of blood was not held guilty of blood—a provision which tended to check feuds.¹² A tribal mark distinguished the members of the tribe and gave notice to all outsiders that who-

ever killed one of them incurred the vengeance of the whole tribe.¹³ The expulsion of Cain is a case in point. "And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him."¹⁴ Blood revenge prevailed in ancient Egypt, along with the tribal mark, and it even survived as late as the first half of the nineteenth century, A.D., third cousins of the murderer and his victim being the limits of responsibility on either side.¹⁵

Private vengeance was the usual form of justice among the ancient Iranians. Blood revenge for murder was not only a right but a duty. *Blut heischte wieder Blut*. The Zoroastrian religion attempted to check its operation, though with little success, and it continued in full force among the non-Zoroastrian peoples. The obligation furnished the motive for many feuds among the Iranians and was a prominent cause of their uninterrupted wars with the Turanians.¹⁶

Ancient Arabian society was based on the operation and interaction of two principles: that the only effective bond is a bond of blood, and that the purpose of society is to unite men for offense and defense. These two principles met in the law of blood feud, based on the theory that the blood bond, embracing all men who bear a common group-name, constitutes a standing obligation to take up the quarrel of every tribal brother. Within the kindred group there could be no blood feud, for if a man killed one of his own kin he found no one to take his part. "Either he is put to death by his own people or he becomes an outlaw and must take refuge in an alien group. On the other hand, if the slayer and the slain are of different kindred groups a blood-feud at once arises, and the slain may be avenged by any member of his own group on any member of the group of the slayer." The kindred group in Arabia "was not the family or household, not the relatives of the slayer and the slain within certain degrees of kinship, as we reckon kinship, but a definite unity marked off from all other groups by the possession of a common group-name. Such a group the Arabs commonly call a *hayy*. . . . To determine whether a man is or is not involved in a blood-feud it is not necessary to ask more than

whether he bears the same group-name with the slayer or the slain. . . . No man who is within the group can escape responsibility merely because he is not a close relation of the slayer or the slain. . . . Kinship then among the Arab means a share in the common blood which is taken to flow in the veins of every member of a tribe—in one word, it is the tribal bond which knits men of the same group together and gives them common duties and responsibilities from which no member of the group can withdraw.”

Owing to the state of incessant hostility and warfare between the tribes, it was absolutely necessary that the members of a tribe stand together and avoid internal quarrels in order to survive in the severe competition of life. This unity of the group or *hayy* was maintained only by the principle of the blood feud, i.e., that all must act together in war and that no one must protect his kinsman for the murder of a man of his own blood. But family feeling was stronger than tribal feeling, and before the time of Mohammed the old notion of a wide blood bond uniting the entire *hayy* had been greatly relaxed. Blood revenge had come to be considered the affair of the immediate kindred rather than of the whole kindred group. As a result, blood vengeance became common between kindred groups, giving rise to fratricidal as well as intertribal wars and making for social disintegration. These wars of revenge were the most deadly; the men were slain and the women sold into foreign slavery.¹⁷

Arab law today decrees that whoever sheds the blood of a man thereby owes a debt of blood to his family. This law is sanctioned by the Koran (ii. 173), although compensation is allowed (xvii. 35). The Bedouins, however refuse to settle blood feuds by the latter means. They claim blood, not only from the actual slayer but from all his relatives, according to the right of *Thár* or blood revenge, which lasts for four generations in the direct line of descent from the slayer and the person slain. The stronger and the more independent a tribe, the less frequently does it sanction the commutation of the right of *Thár* into a fine. To forego the right of personal revenge is considered shameful; an Arab proverb states: “Were hell-fire to be my lot, I would not relinquish the *Thár*.”

Blood revenge is claimed even for death in open war, and any means of obtaining it are considered lawful.

Blood revenge is so certain and unrelenting that in a certain respect it even makes for peace, or at least curtails slaughter. Since every death brings it into operation, and accounts are always balanced, the Arab, except under the greatest provocation, will think twice before he slays a man. Thus the dread effects of blood revenge prevent many a sanguinary conflict and may render "the most inveterate war nearly bloodless." Burckhardt¹⁸ says that for this reason two tribes may be at war for a whole year without the loss of more than thirty or forty men on each side. An Arab, moreover, never kills an unresisting foe, unless to avenge the blood of a relative, and if in battle he encounters a personal friend in the enemy's ranks, he turns his mare aside and cries, "Keep away! let not thy blood be upon me!" The Arabs make a distinction between "blood" and "slaughter." When there is "blood between the tribes," it means that the death of some relative is being avenged; when there is "slaughter," that one tribe has ruthlessly put to death all the males of their enemies whom they have been able to seize, without reference to the number of their own people slain by their adversaries. In the latter case, the aggrieved party will retaliate by killing a double number of their enemies under the same circumstances of cruelty. "Slaughter" occurs most frequently among the mountain Arabs, whose wars are always more sanguinary and inveterate than those of the inhabitants of the plains. In general, the institution of blood revenge has been salutary, preventing the tribes from exterminating one another. Its fundamental laws are essentially the same throughout the whole Arabian desert.

The law of blood vengeance, with its natural consequence, the vendetta, still obtains among the Berbers of Morocco. "The blood feuds which result from the operation of this law are among the chief sources of the continual fighting among the tribes, though often it is a simple raid or highway robbery which gives rise to a quarrel in which eventually some thousands become involved."¹⁹ In the Riff, bloodshed and blood feuds are of everyday occurrence. They are so common that "the people of the tribes of that coun-

try assert that no one's life is safe, for the very fact of relationship or tribal fellowship with another renders a man liable to lose his life at any moment." Pitched battles, however, rarely take place, since the avenger prefers to dog his enemy's steps until from some ambush he is able to pull the trigger upon him.²⁰

Blood revenge has been practiced by all Indo-European peoples.²¹ Among the Greeks of Homer's time, it was the usual form of penal law, and the settlement of disputes was in the hands of the parties immediately concerned. Even today, among the *Mai-notes* in southern Sparta, homicide is said to be regarded as a matter which concerns individuals alone.²² Among the early Greeks the bonds of blood kinship were extremely strong, and blood revenge was an imperative duty. Homicide was dealt with by direct reprisal, on the principle of blood for blood. "Manslaughter within one's own community or tribe drew down immediate blood-vengeance from the brothers and other relations of the slain man." The friends of the slain man were normally bound to avenge his death and might even pursue the murderer into distant lands. The killing of a slave was a matter of little moment, for slaves had no avengers. Vengeance was taken, however, for a companion fallen in battle. "After the death of Patroclus, Achilles took no more prisoners, and the blood-vengeance descended upon all the offender's blood-kin and community, upon women and innocent children."²³ In later times the idea of blood revenge developed into the conception of avenging gods or furies, and out of the fear of divine vengeance arose the notion of guilt.²⁴

Blood revenge was in operation in ancient England, where the blood bond gave to society both its military and social form.²⁵ It was prohibited by King Edmund but did not die out immediately. Among the clans of the Scotch Highlands, as is well known, it survived until modern times. Among the Germanic peoples also, blood revenge early appeared in full force and lasted on until modern times.²⁶ "It was German law that any freeman who had been injured in body, honour, or estate might, with the help of his own people, avenge himself if he would not take the legal commutation; that is to say, he had the right of private war."²⁷ In Scandinavia the feeling long persisted that it was base to accept compensation

for blood. "Life and honor as well as property were under the protection of kin. Blood revenge was a holy duty. The son could not take his inheritance until he had avenged his father."²⁸

Blood revenge still survives among some Indo-European peoples.²⁹ This is particularly true of the Afghans, who live amid uninterrupted family quarrels and feuds. Blood revenge has filled their lives with hatred, hostility, and murder. They keep exact account of the number slain on either side, know how many must fall to square the account, and never rest until this is done. Blood feuds last for generations, demand heavy sacrifices, and destroy the peace and prosperity of the whole people.³⁰ The inhabitants of Daghestan are described as "a people who still admit the vengeance of blood, and make the remotest relation of the murderer or some other trespasser responsible for his deed."³¹

The primitive law of vengeance is still in force in Montenegro and Albania, though sometimes modified by composition. "In Montenegro, until recent times the word 'friend' had not the English meaning. You could not be the friend of a man to whom you were not in some way related. If you were not a friend, you were, of course, a possible enemy. It is possibly on this account that blood relationships were traced to such great lengths." In case of a murder involving two families in the same tribe, the heads of the tribe intervened speedily to prevent the loss of fighting men, though rarely in time to prevent some bloodshed. In a murder involving members of different tribes, the kinsmen of the murdered man flew to arms and a blood feud was inaugurated which was likely to last for years, especially if the murderer were a Moslem.³²

In Albania conditions are even more primitive. Blood vengeance is regarded as divinely ordained by the so-called laws of Lek, a culture hero. Everything in the life of an Albanian turns on *ghak*, blood. The family blood feud is the main topic of conversation. Blood revenge is looked upon as "an act performed for self-purification, and as such a solemn and necessary act. For there are certain offences that blacken, not merely the honour of the man against whom they have been committed, but blacken also the honour of his whole house and even of his tribe. Only blood can cleanse the stain. And the man whose honour is blackened is ob-

sessed with the idea of his own impurity. It gives him no rest. Blood he must have. In all the outlying tribes in which the blood laws are quite unmodified, male blood of the offender's house, even of a quite distant cousin, suffices; or if the affair be intertribal, blood of the offender's tribe. In such cases an absolutely innocent man who is ignorant of the cause of the offence may be sacrificed; and his blood cleanses the other's honour, who, triumphant, announces his deed. He is now in turn liable to be shot, and should he have slain a man of his own tribe, by tribe law his house will be burnt, and in some districts his trees felled and his cattle slaughtered too. But all this is of but small moment. His honour is clean, and if he must die he dies happy. A man of the Christian tribe of Nikaj who was seeking blood was exhorted by the Franciscan to desist, and threatened with the torments of hell. 'I would rather clean my honour and go to hell,' he replied, and went out to slay. He slew, but was himself mortally wounded. The Franciscan hastened to the spot, and begged him to confess and repent while yet there was time. The dying man said, 'I do not want your absolution or your heaven, for I have cleansed my honour.' And he died. We may regret that 'his honour rooted in dishonour stood;' but there is a tragic grandeur about the man who is ready to sacrifice all he has, all that he holds dear, and even life itself, in order that he may do that which he believes to be right. It is not every one that is prepared so to act up to his ideals. When you meet a tribesman and he drinks to you, *Tu ngariat tjetër* (long life to thee), remember to drink *Tu ngariat me neers* (long honour to thee) in return; for honour is better than life—in Albania."⁸⁸

CHAPTER X

HUMAN SACRIFICE

PRIMITIVE peoples, as we have seen, ascribe all phenomena to supernatural agency. Most of the agents—spirits and gods—are malignant and take delight in injuring the living; they send down all manner of bad luck, calamities of every description. To avert misfortune and to win over the divinities, primitive man devised a system of propitiation—means of pleasing them, or at least of buying them off and thus escaping the effects of their malignity.

Some of these supernatural beings are deified ancestors; others are spirits with human attributes. They are conceived as having the same desires and needs as mortals; they lead a life to all intents and purposes similar to that in this world. To propitiate them, therefore, one simply provides them with the things the living want or need. They hunger just as the living hunger; hence food is furnished them. They need weapons, clothing, and other material things, so they are likewise provided with these. Should these gifts be withheld, the spirits and gods would suffer deprivation and be angry. To secure their good graces, the living must, in short, render them all manner of services of a type pleasing to mortals. These are summed up in the word "sacrifice."

Sacrifices are of all kinds and descriptions, but we are here concerned in particular with human sacrifices.¹ Among the various types of human sacrifice, two of the most important are the offering of victims as food for the gods and the providing of the dead with servants.² Where men are anthropophagous, it is but natural for them to offer their divinities human flesh like any other food. But human sacrifice frequently survives where cannibalism has disappeared. Where the gods are deified ancestors, for example, they often retain habits and desires which the living have outgrown. This is a phase of the conservatism of religion. Cannibalism survives in the cult long after the people have given it up, and human

beings must be sacrificed to the still anthropophagous deities, who are held, to be sure, to eat not the flesh but the spirits of the victims.³

The next world is a replica of this, and the same social order prevails. A chief with attendants here will need them after he is dead. To provide them, his wives and servants are killed on his grave, and slaves and others are sacrificed from time to time to increase his retinue.⁴ It may also be desirable to communicate with the dead, to send messages to them. What is more natural than actually to despatch messengers? Thus another motive is given for human sacrifice.

The purpose of human sacrifice is always to please or propitiate the gods. In return for such favors, the living expect certain advantages, usually the avoidance of misfortune and calamity or the success of some important undertaking, for instance a hunting expedition or war. The transaction partakes of the nature of a bargain; if the gods send good fortune or at least withhold evil, man will see that they are kept supplied with all they need or desire.

The victims of human sacrifice are sometimes members of the tribe, notably the wives and attendants of the deceased. Commonly, too, criminals or slaves, whose loss is not keenly felt, are offered up. But extensive sacrifice of its own members would tend to weaken the tribe. Hence, when many sacrifices are needed, it is good policy for the tribe to utilize its prisoners of war for this purpose, or even to undertake wars to secure them.

The custom of sacrificing human victims on the graves of the dead still exists in Azimba and Chipitaland. "When a chief or any one of importance dies, presents of slaves are sent in by all the neighbouring chiefs as an offering to the spirit of the departed." They are killed and thrown into the grave, and the body of the deceased chief is laid on top. When there are not enough victims for the occasion, war is undertaken to obtain more.⁵ In Dahomey, the immediate attendants and favorite wives of the departed were sacrificed at his funeral "so that he may find himself surrounded by those he knows." At the death of a king, many victims were required. This was known as the Grand Custom. There were also Annual Customs, when the dead kings were supplied with fresh servitors. To secure the great number needed for these

occasions, war was regularly waged.⁶ The Awemba held similar sacrifices at the funeral ceremonies of their kings.⁷

Many tribes in Borneo make human sacrifices when a great chief dies, although animals are coming to be substituted in some cases.⁸ The Kayans make slaves to kill at funerals in order to provide the deceased with attendants.⁹ Slaves are also sacrificed to the departed spirits in Celebes.¹⁰ On the occasion of a death in the Solomon Islands, a war party sets out for victims.¹¹ In New Georgia, wars are undertaken for the express purpose of obtaining prisoners to be kept as slaves and sacrificed at the death of the owner.¹² In Northeast India slaves are not infrequently paid by one village to another in settlement of a fight, and they are invariably slaughtered as an offering to the spirits of the tribesmen who have been killed.¹³ These cases recall the fact that the Trojan warriors whom Achilles took captive were destined from the first for an offering at the funeral pyre of Patroclus.¹⁴

To send messengers to the dead requires continual sacrifices. In the Niger Delta, West Africa, this meant sixty or more slain yearly in each town, while in city-states like Benin the number was much larger. "Incorrigible thieves, murderers, and other malefactors were generally reserved for this purpose, but when the supply of these ran short, slaves would be purchased for the occasion, or a special raid on some neighbouring people would be organized."¹⁵ In Dahomey, the dispatching of messages to the deceased kings was the cause of a far greater loss of human life than were the Customs, according to Ellis,¹⁶ who estimates that five hundred persons were slain in ordinary years for this purpose. The securing of the necessary victims was one of the primary objects of every campaign.

Numerous other occasions require sacrifices. Among them are the building of a new house, the launching of a new canoe, in short, any enterprise needing insurance against ill luck. The gods may be propitiated by sacrifices of goods, animals, or human beings.¹⁷ Where human victims are required, raids may be undertaken to secure them.

Among the Toaripians, when a temple is built, "a fighting expedition is planned and life is taken."¹⁸ In Shortland Islands, a sacrifice is made at the building of a war canoe. If no slave is at hand, a war party starts out to secure a victim. Human sacrifices are also needed in the Solomon Islands to conclude the mourning festivities, and the natives then go out to murder.¹⁹ Prisoners taken in war are reserved for use at

a funeral or at the launching of a war canoe.²⁰ When the daughter of an important Maori chief was tattooed, a day was set apart for the occasion, and a party went forth to secure a member of another tribe for sacrifice.²¹ Certain Congo tribes require human sacrifices to celebrate the settlement of a dispute between rival chieftains.²²

Human sacrifices are frequently made with the intent of averting a calamity. The Batjwapong of South Africa, whenever there was a drought, would waylay a man and strangle him, hoping thereby to appease the gods and secure rain.²³ War, perhaps more than any other contingency, may threaten the destruction of a group. It therefore furnishes one of the most urgent occasions for securing the aid of the gods, who, be it noted, are universally believed to take part in the struggle. To win their assistance, human sacrifices are frequently made. The case of the king of Moab,²⁴ who, when he "saw that the battle was too sore for him," offered up his eldest son "for a burnt offering upon the wall," is frequently paralleled in ethnography. Before the battle begins, precaution is taken to assure divine aid by sacrificing victims, and after the battle has been won, similar sacrifices are made as a thank offering. The gods, especially the god of war, are also periodically propitiated in this way in order to retain their good will. In order not to reduce their own ranks to provide victims for such purposes, tribes will sacrifice their captives or make war to obtain victims.

Among the Ewe-speaking peoples of West Africa, in particular the Dahomans, human beings were sacrificed to propitiate or mollify the gods, or as thank offerings after a successful war. The victims were chiefly captives, though criminals were often slain. Human sacrifices were ordinarily made only in times of war, pestilence, or other great calamity. Prisoners of war were invariably sacrificed as a thank offering for a victory, not only in homage but also in the hope of more favors to come. But these thank offerings were not, as a rule, spontaneous; the gods through their priests demanded them as their fruits of the victory. In the early days of the kingdom of Dahomey these sacrifices were made on a large scale; four thousand Whydahs, for example, were sacrificed to the gods upon the conquest of that state in 1727.²⁵

Human sacrifice prevailed on an equally grand scale among the Tshi-speaking peoples of the Gold Coast.²⁶ In Ashanti, for instance, hun-

dreds of people were sacrificed annually, the majority of the victims being slaves or prisoners. War was never undertaken without first consulting the chief local deities and offering sacrifices to obtain their aid during the struggle. Thus in 1874 human victims were sacrificed to Adansi, a god residing in the Adansi Hills, to prevent the British expeditionary forces from crossing that range. In 1878, an opposing force attempted—unsuccessfully—to prevent the passage of the Prah river by the Ashanti army by the sacrifice of seventeen persons to the river god. In 1807, when Ashanti conquered Assin, thousands of prisoners were offered up to the same god. It was customary in Ashanti to sacrifice a number of prisoners to the *manes* of the former kings in gratitude for their assistance, since victory was always attributed to them. "Prisoners of war, being the worshippers and followers of the gods which have contended against the gods of the victors, are considered to be peculiarly acceptable offerings to the latter; and the result is that after a successful engagement a dreadful slaughter of prisoners invariably takes place, which, though it has commonly been attributed to inherent bloodthirstiness, really proceeds from a sense of religious duty to the gods."²⁷

Among the neighboring Yoruba-speaking peoples, human sacrifice prevailed on a much smaller scale, for the Yoruba kings and chiefs were greatly inferior in power to those of Dahomey and Ashanti and much less warlike. The sacrifice to Ogun, the god of war, on the event of resorting to arms, was merely a slave purchased for the occasion.²⁸ In Benin, however, terrible human sacrifices were an integral part of the religious ceremonies and rites, especially when an enemy was at the gates. The yearly sacrifices numbered thousands, and to secure the requisite victims the king of Benin would send out his army to raid other villages.²⁹

The Santals of India used to offer human sacrifices to a mountain god, and even within relatively recent times village headmen have kidnapped strangers and immolated them.³⁰ The Garo Hill tribes of Bengal practiced human sacrifice, usually selecting their victims from the Bengali villages in the plains.³¹ At Koetei, in Borneo, captives were held as slaves until human sacrifices were wanted.³² In Sarawak prisoners of war were offered up for thanksgiving on the return from a successful military expedition.³³ In the Marshall Islands sacrifices were continually made to the war gods.³⁴

The sacrifice of captives to war gods was not uncommon among the American Indians.³⁵ The Aztecs of Mexico waged war primarily to secure victims for Huitzilopochtli, the god of war.³⁶ This deity was

honored and glorified above all others. "His altars must be red with blood, for blood alone could extort his favor, and wars were frequently waged solely for his propitiation." The Mexicans were therefore more anxious to capture than to slay, and this is one reason why they did not poison their weapons. Practically all prisoners were sacrificed, the number amounting to at least twenty thousand annually. The neighboring nations imitated the Mexican manner of disposing of captives, keeping them for sacrifice at their festivals.³⁷

Among the Mayas of Central America, captives, if of noble birth, were sacrificed to the gods, especially at the great feast of victory; prisoners of plebeian blood were offered only in default of victims of higher rank. Raids were also occasionally undertaken with no other object than to obtain victims.³⁸ The Araucanians of Chile likewise sacrificed war captives at a great feast in celebration of victory.³⁹

Among more advanced peoples prisoners of war have received similar treatment. Herodotus⁴⁰ states that the Persians sacrificed the first enemy taken in battle. The Homeric Greeks offered up Trojan prisoners.⁴¹ Themistocles before the battle of Salamis sacrificed three captive Persians to Dionysus.⁴² The Etruscans treated their captives in like manner, and Octavius sacrificed three hundred prisoners to Caesar.⁴³ The ancient Germans were not immune from this practice, and the heathen Slavs as late as the twelfth century vented their "insatiable thirst for blood" by sacrificing their Christian captives.⁴⁴

CHAPTER XI

HEAD-HUNTING

HHEAD-HUNTING, as the term indicates, is the practice of slaying enemies to obtain heads. The victims are decapitated and their heads carried off to be preserved and used for various purposes. This custom plays so large a part in the lives of certain primitive peoples that it is commonly regarded as their most distinctive characteristic. The head-hunting culture complex is such a persistent religious cause of war that it demands special treatment. It is found in certain parts of Africa but is more widespread in Indonesia, New Guinea, Melanesia, and parts of Polynesia, Micronesia, and India.

The heads are carefully preserved. When the tribes of Borneo succeed in cutting off the head of an enemy, they scoop out the brains through the nostrils and hang it up to dry in the smoke of a wood fire. The hair is cut off to ornament their sword-hilts and sheaths. If the jaws drop, they are fastened up; if the teeth fall out or are extracted, the cavities are filled with wooden imitations. Studs are inserted in the eye sockets, and sometimes the skull is carved. The nostrils are generally plugged with wooden stoppers. The tongue is cut out. When the head has been thus prepared, it is generally hung up in the verandah in front of the fireplace. The cluster of heads, resembling a bunch of fruit, is the most prized ornament of the house, is handed down from father to son as a priceless heirloom, and is added to whenever possible.¹

Other head-hunting tribes preserve the heads of slain enemies in somewhat the same manner. The Papuans of British New Guinea decapitate their enemies with a special bamboo knife, insert a head-suspender through the mouth, and carry the head home by this means. A fire is then made, and the head is placed over it until the hair is singed off. All the flesh is removed. The head is well cleaned, often decorated, and then hung up on the main post of the house or attached to the uprights of certain wooden figures. This careful preservation of skulls has enabled European museums to obtain many specimens for

accurate description and measurement.² In Dutch New Guinea the heads are dried in a fire and later placed in grottoes.³ Among the Kiwai Papuans and their neighbors the head is mummified and painted, and, to restore the countenance, it is covered with a mask of resinous wax, adorned with red berries and cowrie shells.⁴

In Timor the head is preserved by removing the brain and drying the flesh and skin before a slow fire.⁵ Heads are similarly preserved and often decorated in the Solomon Islands,⁶ the Murray Islands,⁷ and Celebes.⁸ Among the Tangale of West Africa, the heads are cleaned and placed separately in little earthen pots, which are then covered and buried.⁹ The Nigerian head-hunters, after preparing the heads, tie them to a pole and then set the latter up in the ground.¹⁰ The Nagas and other tribes of northeastern India expose the captured heads on bamboo poles. When the skull has become quite clean, it is decorated with a pair of horns, either buffalo or methua, and is hung in the morong or bachelors' house, where rows of them are suspended by strings along the wall.¹¹

Among these peoples the desire to obtain the heads of enemies is the commonest cause of war. They often expect and obtain no other advantage from war than the acquisition of heads. The question naturally arises: why their passionate desire for human heads? The motive is suggested by their treatment of the heads and will be found to reflect their religious beliefs.

It is universally held among primitive peoples that the soul is located somewhere in the human body—in the heart, the breath, the blood, or some other vital part. Very frequently its seat is the head. Consequently, when an enemy is decapitated, the possessor of his head has possession at the same time of his soul. The head is treated as if alive, as if still the seat of the slain man's soul. Thus the Chin Hill tribes placed their captured heads on posts outside the village, for "it was feared that the spirits of the murdered persons would haunt the village if they were taken or kept inside."¹² Other tribes, as we have seen, place the heads in special houses or suspend them in the verandahs. In any case, the wrath of the slain men is feared, especially since they are now spirits with greater power to injure the living. The spirits residing in the heads must therefore be propitiated. Thus arises an important cult characteristic of head-hunting peoples.

In Borneo special ceremonies and rites accompany the return of a successful head-hunting expedition.¹³ Feasts are given in honor of the gods to whom the success is ascribed, and food is offered to the captured heads.¹⁴ The heads, when prepared as described above, are propitiated by offerings of betel nut, food, and even cigarettes, and are implored to remain and to induce more of their friends to come and keep them company.¹⁵ The natives of Central Celebes propitiate the souls of those whose heads they have taken and placed in the temple.¹⁶ The Nagas and neighboring tribes place food and drink beside the heads, "in order that the disembodied spirits might not haunt the victors, but travel in peace to the city of the dead."¹⁷ In Africa, the Tangale brave, in burying a head, places a little ground corn in the pot as an offering, at the same time praying to the head.¹⁸ The Fang make offerings to the skulls, addressing them by name.¹⁹

From the propitiation of the heads certain benefits are expected to accrue to the victors. This is the reason why, among the Nigerian head-hunters, the heads are regarded as valuable possessions and are handed down from generation to generation.²⁰ The Fang will murder a person to gain possession of his skull, through which, they believe, they can obtain "women, guns, goats or goods." They pray to the skulls and believe that their prayers are always answered.²¹ It is the spirits, it must be remembered, who control all phenomena. All good as well as all evil comes from them. It is a great advantage, therefore, to obtain possession of a spirit by holding the object in which it resides. It may thus be induced to send blessings to the possessor.

That the above is the fundamental idea underlying the custom of head-hunting is apparent from the very words of the natives themselves. A tradition among the Kenyahs of Borneo states that a frog told them to cut off the heads of their enemies instead of merely the hair, which had formerly been taken to decorate their shields, because "if you were to take away the whole skull you would have everything you required—a good harvest and no sickness, and but very little trouble of any kind."²² When Furness²³ asked a Kalamantan native why they killed one another for their heads, the latter replied: "The custom is not horrible. It is an ancient custom, a good, beneficent custom, bequeathed to us by our fathers and our fathers' fathers; it brings us blessings, plenti-

ful harvests, and keeps off sickness, and pains. Those who were once our enemies, hereby become our guardians, our friends, our benefactors." The war god of the Sea Dyaks, as we have already seen, is honored because he provides plenty of heads, and he is petitioned for more heads when a good harvest is wanted.²⁴ The Wa of Indo-China illustrate the same notion of securing advantages through head-hunting. They believe that Ya Htawm and Ya Htai, two mythical ancestors, enjoined on their children the necessity of having a human skull in their settlements at all times. Without it, the people could not enjoy peace, plenty, prosperity, or comfort. The injunction has always been piously obeyed. "The Wa regards his skulls as a protection against the spirits of evil, the same as holy water, or the sign of the cross, or like texts at a meeting house, or Bibles on the dressing table at a temperance hotel, or hallelujahs at a Salvation Army service. Without a skull his crops would fail; without a skull his kine might die; without a skull the father and mother spirits would be shamed and might be enraged; if there were no protecting skull the other spirits, who are all malignant, might gain entrance and kill the inhabitants, or drink all the liquor."²⁵

Heads frequently play an important part in special religious rites. A human head may be required for the funeral of a relative or the launching of a canoe. The Kayans cannot bury a person until a head has been obtained; heads are likewise needed for certain religious feasts and festivities.²⁶ Among the Sea Dyaks, human heads are required for the funeral rites at the death of a relative and for sacrifice to the spirits when a new village is built.²⁷ The close connection of head-hunting and human sacrifice is seen in the fact that in Borneo head-hunting expeditions are frequently undertaken to secure human victims.²⁸

The Solomon Islanders wage war to obtain heads to honor a dead chief or launch a new canoe. No person may be buried without this sacrifice. A new war canoe is not invested with the supernatural qualities which render it invincible until a life has been taken by those on board; consequently any unfortunate voyager encountered on the first trip is hunted down for this purpose. Prisoners of war are kept until an occasion arises when their heads are required.²⁹ In Celebes, it was

an act of religious duty to place heads on the grave of a chief; "as far as possible the heads of some of the enemy were offered up to the departed spirit of the master, but in their default slaves were sacrificed."⁸⁰ The Malays, after a death, set out to kill the first person they can surprise; they cut off his head and use it to propitiate the spirit of the deceased.⁸¹

Another religious motive leading to head-hunting is the belief that the slain become slaves to the victor in the next world. This notion is an incentive to warlike prowess among the Nigerian head-hunters.⁸² The Bangala of the Congo believe that the ghosts of those slain in war serve their conquerors in the spirit land; instead of propitiating the skulls, however, they mistreat and insult them as a means of gaining authority over their indwelling spirits.⁸³ The Dyaks of Borneo hold that a man will have as many servants in the next world as he has heads in this, indeed, that his rank there will be determined on the same basis.⁸⁴ One who has succeeded in killing many enemies leads a life of ease in the future world.⁸⁵ Other Borneo tribes, as well as the Nagas of India, believe that the ghosts of those whose heads they take will serve them in the after life.⁸⁶

Important as are these motives in the practice of head-hunting, they do not tell the whole story. The element of vanity is also present, for the head is a trophy. The possession of many heads distinguishes one as a valiant warrior. In Borneo generally, those who have taken heads receive a tattoo mark on the arm for each one, and are looked upon as very brave.⁸⁷ Head-hunting is also a means of ingratiating one's self with the opposite sex, for "if a man has taken the head of an enemy, he is made much of by the women, and, if unmarried, mothers and fathers are anxious to secure him for a son-in-law."⁸⁸ Heads are even used as bridal gifts.⁸⁹

Of the tribes of Sarawak Haddon⁴⁰ says: "there can be little doubt that one of the chief incentives to procure heads was to please the women." Roth⁴¹ corroborates this statement, extends it also to include the natives of British North Borneo, and says further that the women actually urge the men on to war for heads. Gomes⁴² says of the Sea Dyaks that "the reason why the young

men are so anxious to bring home a human head is because the women have so decided a preference for a man who has been able to give proof of his bravery by killing one of the enemy. In the old days no Dyak chief of any standing could be married unless he had been successful in procuring the head of an enemy. For this reason it was usual to make an expedition into the enemy's country before the marriage feast of any great chief could be held."

In Borneo the possession of a large number of heads is also a qualification for the chieftainship, and certain feasts can only be held by a war leader who has been particularly successful against the enemy and has succeeded in taking many heads.⁴³

The Papuans of the archipelago measure the merit of a man by the number of heads he has taken.⁴⁴ In British New Guinea honor is awarded on the basis of skulls. "No young man could marry, as no woman would have him, without skulls. Often a family would leave, and go away for a length of time, and then return with skulls—perhaps all of them were bought—so that it might be said that they had skulls."⁴⁵ Such is the force of public opinion. In Dutch New Guinea no youth is considered an adult until he has taken a head; here is presented a motive for continual fighting. One who has secured an enemy's head is esteemed as a Mambri or hero, a feast is given in his honor, and his hair is adorned with flowers and his hair-comb with feathers, each one signifying a captured enemy head. Those who have not thus bravely distinguished themselves may not put on such adornment. In order to become leaders in the sect of Mambri, the men strive to take as many heads as possible. The most successful becomes the war leader and acquires the privilege in time of peace of leading the dance at the festivities.⁴⁶ The Murray Islanders preserve the heads of slain enemies as a proof of their prowess.⁴⁷ The natives of western Torres Straits make head-hunting forays "in order to possess themselves of the skulls of the slain, and thus to gain glory and the approbation of their women."⁴⁸

When the natives of Timor return from a head-hunting expedition they are saluted by the women, who come out to meet them with music and the cry of *Oswai! Oswai!* (Braves! Braves!). "For every head the fortunate warrior brings back he receives a present from the rajah, and a circular disk, or *lua* of gold, which he henceforth continually wears—a Timorese Victoria Cross." Forbes⁴⁹ cites an incident showing the

extremes to which the social approbation of head-hunting may be carried. He was riding one day, attended by a native, the son of one of the chiefs, when they encountered three men standing by the roadside. The native turned to him and said, "Do you see the tallest of those three men?" Receiving a reply in the affirmative, he continued with some show of admiration: "He is an *oswai*; he cut off my father's head!" He betrayed no emotion on the subject, nor did he use any opprobrious remarks about the man, nor exhibit any disgust or loathing towards him. Forbes asked the native if he bore the man any ill-will. "Oh, no," he replied; "the two kingdoms are now at peace, and have given back the heads they took." Some of these tribes, who fight on horseback, tie their legs beneath their horses' bellies so that, in the event of their being wounded or killed, their horses will carry them back to their own village and save their heads.

The Nigerian head-hunters take the heads of enemies as much for trophies of prowess as for religious reasons, and a male is not supposed to have attained to the dignity of full manhood until he has killed someone.⁵⁰ Among the Tangale of West Africa no young man may marry until he can produce a head.⁵¹ Among the Western Angami in India no one could assume the *toga virilis*, a kilt ornamented with cowrie shells, till he had slain an enemy and taken his head, and in the more powerful villages he might not marry unless so ornamented. The Eastern Nagas were permitted to wear a special collar called the *Kapentali* after taking their first head and a collar of boar's tusks after the second; after the third, a man might wear "on great occasions" an apron covered with cowrie shells; he kept on this cloth a tally of heads taken and was looked upon as a great warrior. Some braves had as many as twenty-five tallies.⁵² Among the tribes of eastern India, a man could not marry until he had won the right to have his face elaborately tattooed, a right not granted until he had taken a human scalp or skull, or shared in some expedition in which scalps or skulls were taken.⁵³ The tribes of southeastern Bengal regard a captured head as a "certificate of manhood."⁵⁴ Among the Ao Nagas of eastern Assam, the successful head-hunters wear, as badges of their prowess, collars composed of pairs of boar's tusks, tied point to point and base to base so that they encircle the neck. Each pair of tusks so worn indicates an enemy's head taken in battle.⁵⁵ The factor of vanity in head-hunting is further shown among these tribes by the custom of using the morongs as trophy-houses for a grand display of the captured heads or skulls. In some cases the skulls are nailed to a large sacred tree in the center

of the village. It is, moreover, considered a point of honor to recover the skulls of relatives and friends who have fallen in battle.⁵⁶

Although head-hunters attach great honor to the possession of a head (i.e., somebody else's), they are not always particular about the means of securing it. Treacherous means or even purchase are often permissible. Indeed, the head of a woman or child may suffice. Thus, among the Nagas, a common method—and a perfectly honorable one—is to lie in wait near the water ghat of a hostile village and kill the first woman or child who comes to draw water. In apportioning honors, no distinction is drawn between the head of a man or that of a woman or child.⁵⁷ Peal⁵⁸ mentions a case where a tribe tied up a captured girl while the chief, singing his war song, danced round before the assembled “braves” and slowly hacked her to pieces.

The Timorese ruthlessly decapitate helpless men, women, and children, even infants, in order to be saluted as *oswai*, brave.⁵⁹ It is of little importance to the Papuan in what way a man has secured a head, that of a woman surprised asleep in the forest being worth as much as that of a warrior killed in battle. So great is the desire to increase the number of trophies that these natives sometimes even go so far as to betray their own people.⁶⁰ The Alfurs hail as a hero any one who secures a head, no matter whether it be that of a woman or child, and throughout Dutch New Guinea the natives will seize any means whatsoever to capture an enemy head, so eager are they for the honor of Mambri. “They do not shun to surprise the enemy in sleep and make him defenceless while they scatter a handful of lime or ashes in his face; then they slay him in this helpless condition.”⁶¹ The Kiwai Papuans frequently purchased heads instead of taking them, often giving canoes in exchange for a skull. Since no man might marry without procuring a head, the young men must obtain them by hook or by crook. Not seldom a youth would go a considerable distance from home, purchase one or more skulls, and, on returning to his village, “put on a solemn and sacred air, and although in confidence to his relatives only, it was soon known by all in the tribe he was a great brave, and the lady he loved would soon be his.”⁶²

The Tangale will stoop to stealing the heads of dead men or even buying heads when unable to get them otherwise. However obtained, the head is displayed as a trophy of valor and permits the young man to marry.⁶³ The natives of Borneo regarded a successful head-hunter

as very courageous, though, as a rule, the heads were procured in the most cowardly way possible, a woman's or a child's being just as good as a man's.⁶⁴ Evans⁶⁵ mentions a case where two young men, in order to secure a head, killed a woman of a neighboring tribe while she was working alone in a garden at some distance from the village.

Still other motives are involved in head-hunting expeditions. Plunder and revenge are common objects in Borneo.⁶⁶ Whatever the origin of the expedition, however, it always ends in the taking of heads, and the youths are trained with this in mind.⁶⁷ The inevitable result of this situation is the intertribal feuds which have existed among these people from time immemorial.⁶⁸ Since the desire for heads is never satisfied, and every head-hunting foray leads to reprisals, expeditions and counter expeditions are never ending.

In New Guinea, head-hunting has led to endless intertribal feuds, and the slightest pretext is seized upon to begin a war to obtain the coveted trophies.⁶⁹ The tribes of Celebes until quite recently were constantly at war with one another as a result of their desire for heads.⁷⁰ Throughout Malaysia the acquisition of enemy heads is a prime object of war; even private excursions are made for this purpose.⁷¹

The effects of head-hunting have been especially serious in the Solomon Islands, where tribe after tribe has been completely wiped out as the result of a long series of head-hunting expeditions.⁷² The people of southwestern Ysabel have suffered severely from the repeated head-hunting forays of the inhabitants of other parts of the same island and of neighboring islands.⁷³ The natives of Shortland Island and of Bougainville have kept up continual war for heads, while the people of Cerama have ever been on the warpath for the same purpose.⁷⁴ "War in New Georgia is pretty well confined to head-hunting expeditions in canoes, undertaken with the sole object of acquiring skulls."⁷⁵ The inhabitants of these islands have almost annihilated the native population of the Russell Island group and have forced the remnant of the coast people on Ysabel to take refuge in the mountains.⁷⁶ The natives of Rubiana and of Rendova Island have between them completely exterminated the inhabitants of the islands of Wana-wana, Kiso, Tetepari, and,

with the exception of a small remnant, those of Kulam-bangara also. They have reduced the population of Márovo from about five hundred to considerably less than one hundred. On one occasion some Rubiana warriors fell upon a small village and took every head in the place. When Rubiana was captured by the British in 1891, the beach was found absolutely littered with skulls, the cherished accumulation of years. In New Georgia, many of the coast people have been driven inland because of the continual head-hunting raids, while the population of the eastern part has declined with great rapidity. "This to a large extent is probably due to head-hunting, which has almost annihilated some villages, and driven the wretched remnant back into the bush. . . . No doubt head-hunting has always been their custom; but it is probable that the advent of rifles, and especially of iron tomahawks, during the last forty or fifty years, has largely increased its fatal effects; so that where one man's head was taken in old times, three or more are taken nowadays."⁷⁷

Head-hunting has also had a disastrous effect among the Naga tribes. It has created a state of incessant hostility, has forced the complete isolation of the tribes, which are compelled to live on fortified hilltops, and has kept all the natives in a constant state of preparedness. Formerly sentries were posted and streets patrolled day and night, and all the young men lived in guardhouses with weapons ready at hand.⁷⁸ The practice has been slowly dying out since the British occupation, but only at the cost of a great deal of money and of constant policing.⁷⁹ Head-hunting raids are likewise becoming rarer among the Chin Hill tribes for the same reason, but they still occasionally occur for the people cannot be immediately weaned away from their addiction to them.⁸⁰

Head-hunting has been a deeply rooted custom among the Balkan peoples, both Christian and Moslem, and is not yet extinct. Miss Durham⁸¹ writes as follows: "My own guide is bitterly ashamed of the fact that he did not get a head in the '76-'77 war, and urges that he was 'only sixteen' at the time. He confessed it reluctantly and added, 'I wish you hadn't asked me.' Of course, it is illegal now in Montenegro to put heads on sticks as formerly. But I heard of heads on sticks in North Albania in 1904—Monte-

negrin heads taken on the frontier. There were any amount of heads taken in the last war by all parties. The Bishop of Kastoria in South Macedonia brought head-hunting quite up to date in 1903 by having the head photographed afterwards, and sending copies to his friends as Christmas or Easter cards—I forget which.”

CHAPTER XII

WAR FOR GLORY

MEN like war. They often fight for the love of excitement or the mere lust of fighting. While it is true, as someone has said, that anyone will fight when he is mad enough, it is also a fact that men will fight when they are not aroused, but just for the fun of it. War offers diversion and relief from ennui. It provides a mode of escape from the monotony of a dull existence. Primitive life seems to afford scanty amusements and means of recreation; the savage is so engrossed in a severe struggle for existence that his life leaves little room for diversion. Hence men like to fight. The most exciting things they know are hunting, herding, and warfare. These are the occupations they enjoy, and their pursuit affords a considerable measure of satisfaction and pleasure.

War also furnishes a ready means of bringing distinction to one's self, for the military virtues have ever been honored and extolled. The women, as we have seen, prefer men who have given proof of their prowess, they receive the returning warrior with songs of praise, they feast him and crowd around to listen to his exploits. All this appeals to man's vanity and gives him additional motives for fighting.

War prompted by these reasons may often be no more serious than play, but sometimes it leads to disastrous results. With the Columbians war was really a form of amusement; it consisted merely of duels, and the two "armies" danced and sang at the battle.¹ It was good fun, and they enjoyed it. The Tlingits in their unfavorable Alaskan environment had little diversion in their lives; it is not surprising, therefore, that love of excitement is given as one of the causes of war among them.² The Hipurinas of the Amazon Valley are said to "delight in war," though not so much from love of excitement as from love of bloodshed.³ The low value set on human life, apparently a general characteristic of

primitive peoples,⁴ often leads, in combination with cruelty, to love of manslaughter for its own sake—to the mere lust of killing. Such seems to be the case among the Gauchos of Central Uruguay,⁵ and also the Záparos of Ecuador, of whom Simson⁶ says, “one of the most prominent traits of this remarkable people is their tendency to, and marked enjoyment in the destruction of life. They are always ready and willing to kill, be it animals or human beings, and delight in such occupation.” Angus⁷ states of a Makanga chief that his greatest delight was “in killing the people who are helpless, and in slave catching.” This bully levied war on all around him, that is, “on every one whom he thinks weaker than himself.”

Of the warlike Masai Routledge⁸ says, “Fighting, or more accurately speaking, the taking of life in war, he loves for its own sake, and he is quite willing to stake his own life for the fun of the thing and the chance of distinction and plunder.” The Fang are also noted for their love of war,⁹ while the Kaffirs, like many other African tribes, regard war and hunting as their favorite occupations.¹⁰

War is good sport. It need not be serious, as is seen for example in the sham fights common among the Omaha Indians,¹¹ the Ba-Mbala, and various East African tribes.¹² The Ba-Mbala call such an affair *Kutana* or small war. A special arena is cleared by burning the grass, and the opposing sides, armed only with bows and arrows, march in single file to the appointed spot, insult each other, then shoot and maneuver till they have had enough. As a rule, no one is slain and little harm is done. If, however, someone should be killed, *Gembi*, or great war, forthwith results.¹³

In Australia fighting is largely an amusement. One of the games of the Euahlayi tribe is a sort of sham fight, in which one man with a bark shield tries to defend himself from the bark toy boomerangs thrown by the others.¹⁴ In Victoria a battle is occasionally arranged to test the strength of a tribe. Sometimes the same tribes hold tournaments or friendly trials of skill in the use of the boomerang and shield, which cease when some one is hit or when all are satisfied. “The natives seem to take great pleasure in these encounters. They have afforded them on such occasions the opportunity of displaying their skill as gymnasts and in the use of their various weapons, and of proving their superiority, not only to the enemy with whom they may be engaged, but to the warriors of their own tribe. Emulation leads them to attempt feats of

daring, and during the excitement of a general engagement they freely risk their lives."¹⁵

Among the tribes of the Chin Hills raids were often undertaken by the young men who wanted something exciting to do.¹⁶ The natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo frequently went to war simply because they liked to fight.¹⁷ Killing is said to be a pleasure to the Papuans.¹⁸ "Sheer lust of fighting" is given as a common cause of war among the Maoris of New Zealand. "War was the only pastime that in his heart of hearts the Maori truly loved," and he never wanted a pretext for fighting.¹⁹ In Rotuma, if a chief wanted to fight and no cause came readily to hand, he would manufacture a cause by stealing a woman from another district.²⁰

Many Polynesian tribes frequently engaged in war merely for the pleasure of fighting.²¹ That the Koreans count war as one of their amusements is seen in their custom of stone-fighting. "Every spring, leave is granted to the people to fight with stones, and the men (and even boys) proceed to open spaces where there are plenty of stones. There they form sides—usually town *versus* country—and have regular pitched battles. Every year quite large numbers are killed, and the wounded are legion."²²

Civilized peoples are not very different from primitive men in this respect. Love of excitement is a powerful incentive in recruiting professional soldiers. It is played upon by the press and other agencies of publicity in mobilizing a nation for war. Military parades and trappings, martial airs, the honors accorded soldiers, and the like throw a glamor around warfare and mask its horrors. Military life affords a release for energies frustrated in monotonous industrial pursuits.²³ In short, it still appeals to man—and to woman vicariously—as an exciting and glamorous adventure.

Personal ambition, especially among chiefs, and intergroup rivalry are motives arising in the main from vanity, and they not infrequently lead to war. Among the Tlingits the desire to obtain slaves in order to increase the power of the chief and his clan is said to have been one of the commonest incentives to war.²⁴ Here vanity is clearly combined with economic motives. The Pima Indians furnish a similar case. "When a chief 'felt in his heart' that he would like to avenge his people . . . or that he desired the honors that reward the successful warrior, he went from settle-

ment to settlement making an appeal for followers by repeating conventional speeches of magic character."²⁵ The war chief among the Indian tribes of the lower Mississippi Valley was not loath to excite his nation to war; "he is so much the more interested, as these chiefs are not nearly as much respected during peace as during war."²⁶ Personal advantage was also a prominent motive of war in Central America. "The ambition of the native rulers to increase their dominions by encroachments upon their neighbors' territory was probably the cause of most wars among the Maya nations," and among the wild tribes wars were prompted chiefly by the jealousies and ambitions of rival chieftains.²⁷

In equatorial Africa, "rivalry amongst the tribes is the cause of everlasting war."²⁸ In northeastern Africa the wars thus occasioned involved the greatest loss of life.²⁹ Mutual jealousy and fear are the root of most intertribal wars in South Africa.³⁰ "Insults to chiefs" and the "despotism or ambition of chiefs whom the malcontents hope to settle by a blow from behind in the turmoil of battle" are ranked among the causes of war in the Fiji Islands.³¹ In Rotuma practically all wars were traceable to rivalry between two districts or their respective chiefs. Any pretext was seized upon, however, if a fight was desired. If, for example, a canoe of one district passed in front of the chief's house in another district without lowering its sail, reparation for the insult would be demanded, and, if it were not forthcoming, war would be declared at once. The failure to declare war under these circumstances was tantamount to the submission of the insulted chief.³² Though there was but one king in Easter Island, war frequently occurred, owing to personal feuds and covetousness.³³ In Samoa a common cause of war was "a desire on the part of one, two, or more districts, to be considered stronger and of more importance than the rest."³⁴

The competition for a "place in the sun," which has played its part in the history of civilized nations,³⁵ is not far removed from the ambition and rivalry of savage chiefs. The doctrine of economic necessity—the cloak which is so habitually assumed—is found, on analysis, to be mostly rationalization. Not life necessity, but national vanity, is too frequently the cause of aggression leading to war. Territorial expansion is prompted, not so much by economic motives—for colonies usually cost more than they bring in return—as by the notion that it is one of the attri-

butes of a great state to have a colonial policy. Great Britain, almost alone, has learned that to hold colonies, they must be left to govern themselves, that "ownership" is more imaginary than real.³⁶ Expansionism and imperialism are merely questions of politics; they arise not from life necessity but from national egoism. It is the custom to cloak them with the dogma of a civilizing mission—the duty of disseminating the nation's higher culture to a benighted or decadent world. The traditional jealousies and rivalries of the Old World are but a part of what Franklin called the "pest of glory."³⁷

War affords an exceptional opportunity for distinguishing one's self. The valiant and heroic receive special consideration and social prestige. Primitive societies place a premium on the successful warrior, because, under conditions of continual warfare, his function is usually one of supreme value. The greater the number of warriors and the greater their prowess, the more secure is the group in the competition of life. Various means are employed to distinguish those who have measured up to the group's idea of social utility. One of the most important of these is tattooing.

The word *tattoo* or *tatu* was first introduced into our language by Cook and Banks in describing the Tahitian custom of puncturing the skin and staining the wounds so as to leave a permanent mark.³⁸ Tattooing is employed by primitive peoples for several purposes—as a tribal mark, to denote membership in a secret society, to identify married women, to distinguish free from unfree and noble from commoner, for ornament or religious purposes, and as an honorary distinction.³⁹ We are directly concerned only with how tattooing bears upon war by serving as a means of distinguishing and honoring the able warrior. In such cases it is ornamental or honorary and is awarded for bravery or success in battle. It appeals very strongly to the vanity of the men. It often shows how many enemies one has killed, and the men vie with one another to win such honors. Boys are not regarded as men until they have won their tattoo marks, and favor with the fair sex depends upon their possession. These strong appeals to vanity incul-

cate a warlike spirit, and wars may even be undertaken solely to win such distinctions.

Since warfare among the natives of Borneo largely takes the form of head-hunting, tattooing is the badge of the successful head-hunter.⁴⁰ Among the Dusuns a warrior can be tattooed only when he has taken a head, and he is allowed a tattoo mark on the arm for each head taken. Tattooed warriors are looked upon as very brave, no matter how their heads have been obtained.⁴¹ The Kayans make distinctions in awarding honors; if a man has taken the head of an enemy he can have the backs of his hands and fingers covered with marks, but if he has merely had a share in the slaughter, one finger only may be tattooed.⁴² The chiefs, however, often break this rule, and have their entire hands tattooed even if they have been on only a single war expedition.⁴³ The Kalamantans tattoo, not as a sign of bravery in battle, but "merely from a desire to copy the more warlike Kayan." The Sea Dyaks tattoo the back of the hand irrespective of bravery in warfare, and most of those thus decorated are conceited braggarts. It is interesting to note that this "wild and irresponsible system of tatu" has been accompanied by a degradation of the designs. Among the Bakatan and Ukit, who carefully guard the honors, the designs are beautifully made. Tattooing is forbidden in the house; it may be performed only on the warpath. Consequently the tattoo artists are exclusively men. "The covering of the body with designs is a gradual process, and it is only the most seasoned and experienced warriors who exhibit on their person all the different designs. . . . The tatu of the legs and feet is the last to be completed, and the lines around the ankles are denied to all but the bravest veterans." Tattooing also serves these peoples as a mark of recognition in warfare. The particular design used for this purpose is a star or rosette pattern called *lukut*, antique bead. "In jungle warfare, where a stealthy descent on an unprepared enemy constitutes the main principle of tactics, it not infrequently happens that one body of the attacking force unwittingly stalks another, and the results might be disastrous if there was not some means of distinguishing friend from foe when at close quarters." Kenyahs, when on the warpath, frequently tie a band of plaited palm fibre around the wrist for the same purpose.⁴⁴

In New Guinea, tattooing denotes that the men so decorated are warriors who have slain one or more of the enemy.⁴⁵ With the Mekeo people, tattooing on the breast used to be a sign that a man had taken human life.⁴⁶ Among the Papuan tribes at Hood Point a boy "is never

tattooed until he has taken a life or assisted to do so.”⁴⁷ Among the Motu and other tribes tattooing on the chest and forehead is an honorable decoration signifying that the wearer has shed human blood. “It is the ambition of every young man to get tattooed. Raids were sometimes made on small villages along the coast for the simple purpose of killing some, that the young men may come back and be tattooed. It was no uncommon thing to hear men quarrelling, and one saying to the other, ‘Who are you that you should talk? Where are your tattoo marks? Whom have you killed that you should speak to me?’ ”⁴⁸

Among the Fang of West Africa young lads are anxious to be tattooed because it makes them feel like “real men.”⁴⁹ The Euahlayi tribe of Australia use tattoo patterns as a tribal mark or “just to look pretty.”⁵⁰ Tattooing is not characteristic of the Australian race, and where it does occur it does not denote bravery. This is perhaps correlated with the fact that the Australians are not very warlike. On the other hand, the Malays, who are very belligerent, employ elaborate tattooing as tribal marks and as indications of the distinction and rank of warriors. Tattoo marks can be acquired only through brave deeds.⁵¹

“Among most Naga tribes the young men cannot be tattooed until they have got or actively assisted in getting a head, hands, or feet of some Naga not of their own or of a friendly tribe—man, woman, or child, it does not matter.”⁵² The right of decoration by tattoo is called *ák*, and is conferred by the Rajah. All who secure heads win the *ák* on the face; those who get hands and feet receive marks on the arms and legs accordingly. Successful head-hunters are sometimes tattooed on their chests, particularly among the Nagas of Assam, one roughly tattooed figure of a man for each head taken.⁵³ Tattooing is regarded by all the Nagas as a sign of manhood, and “until he is so decorated a young fellow is often asked by the girls why he does not wear a woman’s cloth.”⁵⁴ Conversely, a young man who brings in a head is no longer called a boy or a woman and can assist in councils. He is tattooed and may now marry if he chooses. Tattooing among all these tribes is, in short, the sign of full membership in the tribe; “not till a man had shown his efficiency as a fighter might he wear the tribal badge or take the position of a married man.”⁵⁵ Herein lay one of the strongest motives for their inveterate custom of head-hunting.

In Polynesia tattooing is chiefly ornamental; when performed on the men it is a mark of honor, denoting bravery in battle.⁵⁶ The designs of the Tahitians are most elaborate. Every variety of

figure and scene is stamped on the men's chests and arms. Favorite designs are spears, clubs, and other weapons of war or figures of men engaged in battle, triumphing over a fallen foe, or carrying a human sacrifice to the temple.⁵⁷ Among the Maoris, a warrior could not be tattooed until he had distinguished himself in war.⁵⁸ Such honorary marks were known by a special name, *moko*, and consisted chiefly of deep curved lines of dark blue or black. For each exploit new lines were added. Many of the older chiefs and warriors were completely covered by these designs, sometimes extending from the throat to the very roots of the hair, and giving them the appearance of being absolutely black. These tattoo marks were considered by the Maoris "not only as a sign of dignity, but as adding to their fierce appearance when in battle, and a man with his face thus decorated always took rank as a warrior and could not be reduced to the condition of a slave."⁵⁹ The general public acquired the right of *moko* through martial exploits, and after an honorable campaign the chiefs usually added some new design in token thereof.⁶⁰ A youth of twenty was considered unmanly if he had not yet had a taste of this painful ordeal. "To have fine tattooed faces was the great ambition of young men, both to render themselves attractive to the ladies and conspicuous in war; for even if killed by the enemy, whilst the heads of the untattooed were treated with indignity, and kicked on one side, those who were conspicuous by their beautiful *moko* were carefully cut off, stuck on the *turuturu*, a pole with a cross on it, and then preserved; all which was highly gratifying to the survivors and the spirits of their late possessors."⁶¹

The Roman soldiers used to tattoo their skins, but there are few parallel instances among advanced peoples.⁶² Tattooing still survives, though dissociated from earlier notions. It is perhaps significant, however, that it is particularly prevalent among soldiers and sailors.⁶³

Tattooing is essentially a personal decoration. It is found chiefly in southern climes, where little or no clothing is worn and the distinguishing marks are consequently visible. Savages show a universal love of personal decoration; those of the south adorn their bodies, those of the north ornament their clothes.⁶⁴ This dis-

tion pervades the whole field of personal adornment, including the special decoration for warfare. Some tribes paint their bodies; others wear impressive clothes. Military ornament of whatsoever sort is a mark of honor—the savage must prove his worth by killing an enemy before he is allowed to adorn himself. Like tattooing and ornament in general, it marks individuality and appeals to vanity.⁶⁵ For these reasons military adornment, or rather the desire to win it and thus gratify one's vanity, intensifies the warlikeness of primitive men. Ornament is used, not only as a token of prowess, but also to intimidate the enemy. In a few cases, too, it serves for protection, while occasionally it is associated with religious ideas. Its chief purpose, however, is to honor and distinguish the successful warrior; the primary factor involved is vanity. For specific cases of war adornment the reader is referred to Appendix I.

Among the American Indians, especially those of the Plains, warriors were classified into grades and ranks, each with its peculiar insignia, usually bestowed publicly in connection with more or less elaborate ceremonies. War honors were regarded as a man's credentials, and among some tribes, at the recounting of each honor, a blow was struck on a post or some other object. This form of recital was known as "counting coup." A *coup* was a deed of special prowess. A warrior's reputation was determined by the number of *coups* which stood to his credit, and those with the largest number had the greatest social influence.⁶⁶ Our own chevrons for service, campaign badges, medals, and so forth, are but modern forms of war honors.

Vanity plays another rôle in primitive warfare; it is the chief incentive to the taking of trophies. A trophy is simply a proof of the warrior's success in battle, it is evidence of his valor, it marks him as a distinguished and powerful person. Trophy-taking is frequently associated with the mutilation of the dead body of the enemy. A part of the body is carried off in witness of the victor's triumph. It may be the hands, feet, jawbone, hair, scalp, ears, head, teeth, foreskin, or any other portion of the body. It is usually a part which the corpse could not yield in duplicate. The com-

monest trophy is the head, since it is perhaps the most unmistakable proof of victory.⁶⁷

As a result of the primitive notions locating the soul in particular parts of the body, trophies often take on a religious character. If the soul is thought to reside in the head, for instance, head-taking gives the victor possession of the enemy's soul. This, as we have seen, is the basic notion underlying the custom of head-hunting. The possession of a part of one's enemy, moreover, enables one to heap indignities upon his spirit according to the principles of exuvial magic.⁶⁸ Mutilation of the dead may also be practiced to strike terror into the heart of the enemy, or it may be prompted by sheer bloodthirstiness or savagery. The most common element in trophy-taking, however, appears to be simple vanity, for trophies bring honor and influence to their possessor, who wears them as a token of his bravery.⁶⁹

Trophies play an especially important rôle in savage warfare owing to the prominence given the individual. In modern warfare slaughter is too indiscriminate and takes place at too great a distance to permit a person to keep count of his victims or take trophies from them. Savages, on the other hand, usually know precisely who has triumphed, and how, when, where, and over whom. They are acquainted with all the details. Victory is largely a personal matter, and the trophy is a testimony of individual success. Social distinction and praise are awarded according to the number of trophies a warrior has taken. Thus, through an appeal to vanity, he is spurred to further endeavors and others are encouraged to emulate him. The inevitable result is the cultivation of a martial spirit and an additional incentive to war.*

An especially interesting trophy is the scalp. The practice of scalping, so common in the New World, seems to have been motivated largely by religion and vanity. The scalp lock was sometimes thought to be the seat of the soul. Hence its possession gave the victor a certain power over the soul of his victim. The Omaha regarded the hair as typifying life. When a boy was recognized as a member of the tribe and his life dedicated to the god of war, his

* Examples of trophies and of mutilation of the dead are given in Appendix J.

hair was cut with the exception of a small lock which was kept constantly braided. "Upon this lock the talisman and the war honours were worn by the warrior, and it was this lock which was cut from the head of a slain enemy, and formed the central object in the triumph ceremonies, for the reason that it preëminently represented the life of the man who had been killed in battle."⁷⁰ The scalps he had taken followed the warrior into the grave and were thus supposed to establish his fame in the other world. Thus the custom was actuated by religious reasons.⁷¹

Vanity, however, was an even stronger incentive, for scalps were chiefly valued as trophies and as proofs of valor. For each scalp taken, a warrior was entitled to wear an eagle's feather in his hair, and the number of these was the measure of his glory. Among the tribes of the lower Mississippi Valley the object was "less to kill many men among the enemy than to bring away marks which, on return into their nation, may be certain proofs of their bravery—that is to say, to take some scalps."⁷² The Comanches took scalps "for the purpose of being used at the war or scalp dance by which they celebrate a victory." Among the savages of northern Mexico, when a military expedition returned, the warriors were received with congratulations and praises by the women, who seized the scalps and danced and sang round the bloody trophies while the men looked on in approving silence. The rôle of vanity in this custom is especially well marked in the case of the Shoshones, among whom, "he who takes the most scalps gains the most glory. Whether the warriors who furnished the trophies fell by the hand of the accumulator or not, is immaterial; he has but to show the spoils and his fame is established."⁷³ "Taking an enemy's scalp is an honour quite independent of the act of vanquishing him. To kill your adversary is of no importance unless the scalp is brought from the field of battle, and were a warrior to slay any number of his enemies in action, and others were to obtain the scalps or first touch the dead, they would have all the honours, since they have borne off the trophy."⁷⁴

Trophies of a similar nature are by no means confined to savage races. Even civilized peoples have mutilated the fallen enemy in order to carry off proof of their intrepidity. The decapitation of

Goliath by David, followed by carrying his head to Jerusalem, was not exceptional among the Jews.⁷⁵ Among the other parts of the body which they took as trophies were the hands and feet, thumbs, toes, and foreskins.⁷⁶ Similar practices existed in Egypt, for at Abou Simbel, Rameses II is represented as holding a collection of a dozen heads, and the inscription on a tomb at El Kab in Upper Egypt tells how Aahmes, when he had won a hand in battle, received the king's commendation and the golden necklace in token of his bravery. A wall painting in the temple of Medinet Abou at Thebes shows the presentation of a heap of hands to the king, and an accompanying inscription, narrating the victory of Menephtah I over the Libyans, mentions genitals as additional trophies.⁷⁷

The Chinese used to cut off the left ears of their vanquished foes. About 1850, after the suppression of a rebellion in the province of Canton, a large chest filled with ears was forwarded to Governor Yeh as evidence of the victory gained by the Imperial troops.⁷⁸ Genghis Khan, while in Poland, filled nine sacks with the right ears of the slain. The famous pyramids and towers of skulls built by Tamerlane at Aleppo and at Bagdad, where ninety thousand heads were taken, are only too well known.⁷⁹ In Persia not long ago, under the stimulus of money payments, prisoners of war were put to death in cold blood in order that the heads, which were immediately despatched to the king, might make a more impressive showing.⁸⁰ The Gauls and other northern barbarians brought back the heads of enemies killed in battle and sometimes nailed them to the doors of their houses, and up to the time of the Salic Law the heads of slain private foes were fixed on stakes in front of dwellings.⁸¹ The Turks until recently decapitated their fallen enemies. When, in 1876, they treated the Montenegrins in this manner, the latter retaliated in their habitual way by cutting off the noses of the slain Turks.⁸²

Trophies, according to Spencer,⁸³ developed into badges and costumes, and mutilations, indicating social, political, and religious subordination, became less severe when prisoners of war were enslaved, in order that their working ability might not be impaired. While mutilating the body for trophies is extremely

rare in modern warfare, trophies of a different sort are nevertheless taken, and our various museums and private collections of war relics bear witness to the immemorial appeal to individual and national vanity.

CHAPTER XIII

WAR AND THE STATE

A SOCIETY is a group of human beings living in a coöperative effort to win subsistence and to perpetuate the species.¹ The mere proximity of individuals does not constitute them a society; it is only when there is coöperation to satisfy interests that a society can be said to exist.² Any human society, by virtue of the fact that there is coöperation, must be a peace-group, for coöperation presupposes peace. Between societies the competition of life prevails and often leads to war, but within a society it is restrained, and the members combine and coöperate in peaceful ways to carry on the struggle for existence. To do this there is need of organization and some form of social control, if acts are to be effectually combined and adjusted to meet the needs of the group. This organization constitutes the regulative or governmental system.³

The primitive society which shows the least developed regulative organization has been characterized by some authors as the horde.⁴ By this term is meant a small kin-group carrying on the struggle for existence in a very rudimentary way and displaying the least social organization possible for group existence. Letourneau⁵ has called the undeveloped regulative system of such a society primitive anarchy. Although there is in some cases a close approach to the nonexistence of governmental regulation, there is, nevertheless, always some degree of control, be it only the undefined authority of the strongest man, for even the lowest savages cannot live together under what the Germans call *Faustrecht*, "fist-right" or "club-law."⁶ There is some sort of order and authority within the group, else it would have perished in the competition of life. At the very least this rudimentary regulation consists of established customs and prohibitions or taboos, the germ of law, enforced by public opinion and the authority of the old men of the horde.

In primitive horde life there is a rude sort of democracy. Though control is vested mainly in the elders, these do not form an hereditary class; each has attained his position through merit or the wisdom of age. Even on a later stage of tribal society there is loose organization and little social differentiation. Authority is exercised by family or village heads, while chieftainship, where such exists, is nominal and essentially religious in character.⁷ In the more advanced type of patriarchal society the situation alters, class distinctions based on birth and wealth appear, and power is held by the heads of families possessing property and prestige. Yet after all these leaders are in touch with the freemen of the community. All are akin in blood and tread the routine of life together.⁸

For all the essentially democratic nature of these early forms of society, there inevitably arises some degree of social differentiation, at least that depending on personal superiority. The struggle for existence impels toward integration and control and brings the ablest man to the front. Often he is the best hunter or fisher, and in these pursuits the rest are subordinate to him. A position of power or prestige may also be attained through wealth or the deference paid to age, experience, sanctity, or wisdom. The latter qualities are generally given great weight, and they find their typical representative in the medicine man. He is usually the shrewdest man in the tribe and holds a position of great importance since the prosperity of the group is thought to depend on the favor of the gods or spirits with whom he deals.

But precedence also comes through war. When the competition of life brings groups into conflict, the pressure on the group grows more intense and increases the need of integration and control. The function of the warrior then becomes of the greatest social utility. Hence he attains a position of eminence, especially under conditions of incessant intergroup hostility. In times of war the ablest warrior naturally becomes the leader, with centralized and intensified control. Owing to the exigencies of the situation, he possesses more power than is yielded to any single individual at other times. Not infrequently the same person unites the functions of medicine man and war chief, with greater concentration of power

as the result. In times of peace, however, authority is normally wielded by the elders or by a headman or peace chief, like the sachem of the American Indians. In such times the leaders have little regulative power, and the tribe is loosely organized, democratic—except for the position of eminence which is accorded to personal superiority—and in some cases almost atomistic.⁹ These statements represent the situation as found among most primitive peoples. Of the hundreds of cases from which these inductions have been made, many typical instances are set forth at some length in Appendix K.

This preliminary survey of the regulative system of primitive society should furnish a basis for an understanding of the influence of war on governmental organization. The lowest degree of organization is to be found among peaceful tribes like the Eskimos, Veddahs, and Todas. In other instances a very rudimentary organization is a concomitant of nomadic life. Political integration is also elementary among some tribes that are quite warlike. This may be explained on the ground that tribal unity is prevented by civil war and internal strife,¹⁰ or that external wars do not lead to conquest. Where the regulative organization is rudimentary, we find that there are practically no social classes and that the main social differentiation is the distinction accorded certain members—preëminently the medicine man and the war leader—on the basis of personal ability.¹¹ What, now, is the effect of continual war on this democratic, loosely organized state of society?

In the first place, war unites a group as does nothing else. "Only by imperative need for combination in war were primitive men led into coöperation."¹² While this statement of Spencer's is not entirely accurate, since it leaves out of consideration certain other important factors, it is nevertheless true that war exerts a supreme integrating force. Rude societies undergo remarkable changes when war converts the unordered populace into a disciplined army under a leader with powers of life and death. Such transformations have been described by travelers who have witnessed the preparations made by barbaric tribes to invade an enemy's territory or defend their own borders. "Provisions and

property are brought into the common stock; the warriors submit their unruly wills to a leader, and private quarrels are sunk in a larger patriotism. Distant clans of kinsfolk come together against the common enemy, and neighbouring tribes with no such natural union make an alliance, their chiefs serving under the orders of a leader chosen by them all."¹³ The tribe must unite to survive; if incapable of union it succumbs before its better organized enemies. "In union there is strength" is a principle so demonstrable that most primitive tribes have learned the lesson.

The Caribs in time of peace acknowledged no leadership, but "in war experience had taught them that subordination was as requisite as courage."¹⁴ Though the Abipones of Argentina neither feared nor honored their chiefs in peace time, they followed them as leaders and rulers in war.¹⁵ In the Amazon Valley and in North America, independent and even hostile tribes would combine against a common foe.¹⁶ The League of the Iroquois, one of the outstanding examples of political integration, was solidified by their war with the Hurons.¹⁷ Probably no known people has possessed a more rudimentary system of law and government than the Tasmanians, or has shown less union in times of peace, yet as soon as war broke out they assembled around a chosen war chief to whom they rendered absolute obedience.¹⁸ Each Maori tribe was subdivided into independent clans. "There was but little cohesion among them as a rule, unless a common enemy threatened the tribe. Then they would band together, each clan still under its own chiefs, and together face the enemy. Apart from the above, these clans often fought each other."¹⁹ When a great crisis arose, the whole Maori nation would combine for attack or defense, though under ordinary circumstances each tribe managed its own affairs.²⁰ Certain of the Kuki-Lushai clans were compelled by fear of their enemies to live together in large villages, but as soon as this danger was removed they reverted to the ancient system of consanguineous hamlets.²¹ The Bageshu of Africa will combine against a common enemy, though at other times they fight amongst themselves.²² The Bedouins show the same tendency.²³

War not only unites a people; it gives rise to a coercive *régime*. Discipline and subordination are indispensable on the warpath. "In complex coöperation even the willing need an authority over them, for success implies such a delicate poise of numerous individual performances that the Word must go forth and with power.

This is why warfare, the great primary coöperation, is usually the mother of discipline."²⁴ War exerts perhaps the greatest integrating force known; its effect has always been to tighten the reins of government. This is seen at the present day, and it is no less marked among primitive peoples. In time of war personal rights must yield to the superior right of life of the unified community. Today "the state in defense of its life may find it necessary to place large restrictions on, or even to deny *in toto* the rights of its citizens. Obligations, not rights, are emphasized in war."²⁵

Combination and coöperation are demanded by war, but they can only be made efficient by subjection to a single command. Thus arises the war chief with his power. "There is no condition of things under which men's different qualities of courage and cunning tend more constantly to become prominent, and to produce and perpetuate more strongly-pronounced inequalities, than the hostile relations in which savage communities so frequently stand to one another."²⁶ War is the great test. Through inexorable competition the boldest and ablest leader is selected. He attains a supremacy which has no counterpart in times of peace. The longer war endures or the more frequently it recurs, the greater grows his power. Though the military command is supposed to cease with the campaign, as it actually does among some undeveloped tribes, it shows a marked tendency to pass into an enduring dictatorship. Continuity of war conduces to permanency of chieftainship. The successful war chief retains his power in times of peace and becomes a civil head or king. "History is filled with records of great leaders who by their ability in war have founded states and dynasties."²⁷ Priestly functions are often associated with the kingly office, and powerful chiefs or kings are even regarded as divine and worshiped as gods. The constant necessity of meeting pressure from without intensifies the internal organization of society and increases the power of the political head.

Political integration involves class differentiation and the dissolution of the more primitive state of equality.²⁸ War destroys tribal democracy. The first line of demarcation appears between the warrior and non-warrior class, raising the former immeasurably above the latter. The chief of the warriors often becomes

king, and the warriors themselves form a noble caste, beneath whom are the common people. With subjugation, further class distinctions arise. The conquered people are enslaved; thus is produced the widest possible social cleavage—that between freemen and slaves. The slaves are put to work to support the upper classes, who regard war as their chief business. With effective conquest, subjugation, and enslavement, as Gumpłowicz²⁹ was the first to point out, the state arises, and not before. "The state is in origin a product of war," says Keller,³⁰ "and exists primarily as an enforced peace between conquerors and conquered."

The above statement, though it may strike the reader as extreme, accurately represents the accepted view of social scientists today. Dealey³¹ traces the state back to the primitive war band. "The war band's reason for existence was the group need for protection—protection of life, protection of hunting grounds, and later also protection of property." Enslavement added another function to the duties of the war organization. "The victors as overlords, or masters, must keep submissive the mass of subjugated population under their authority. In other words, it must maintain domestic peace by suppressing riots and insurrections, and by compelling the defeated population to labor, or to pay tribute according to dictated terms, and to obey the commands placed upon them by the ruling class. . . . In the light of these two explanations the state stands forth as fundamentally a war band charged with the duty (1) of preserving group safety and (2) of guaranteeing domestic peace by using threat and force so as to render submissive recalcitrant subjects."

Jenks³² likewise asserts that "the military principle was the basis of the State" and that all political institutions are essentially military in character. "In the formation of the modern State, the conspicuous immediate causes are the closely related facts of *migration* and *conquest*." The state was established when a chieftain and his war band got permanent possession of a definite territory of considerable area occupied by a large number of people engaged in the arts of agriculture and industry. The chief characteristics of the state thus formed are the predominance of military power, and loyalty to a sovereign exercising authority

over the entire geographical area rather than to a tribe or organization based on blood relationship. The early state, according to Jenks, was thus a band of warriors under a military leader. "As time went on, and the host-leader became the King, as the band of warriors settled down as the lords and rulers of their fiefs, as hereditary succession to office and title became recognised, as the gatherings around the host-leader of his foremost warriors, in planning the campaign or battle, developed into the Council of Peers for discussing the affairs of the realm, so the State began to assume, in varied forms, the character of an Institution, a piece of machinery which maintains a perpetual existence, despite the death of kings and barons."

Oppenheimer's³³ interpretation is identical. "The State, completely in its genesis, essentially and almost completely during the first stages of its existence, is a social institution, forced by a victorious group of men on a defeated group, with the sole purpose of regulating the dominion of the victorious group over the vanquished, and securing itself against revolt from within and attacks from abroad. . . . The State grew from the subjugation of one group of men by another. Its basic justification, its *raison d'être*, was and is the economic exploitation of those subjugated."

Wundt³⁴ states unmistakably that the state first came about and could originate only in the period of migration and conquest. The matter is excellently summed up by Beard.³⁵ "No fact has been more firmly established by modern historical researches than the origin of the State in conquest. This is not a hypothesis, but a conclusion resting upon the inquiries of innumerable scholars."

"Even now a state's chief business is to be ready for war and to wage it whenever national safety or national interest demand it."³⁶ The state, to be sure, has many other functions, but the supreme function is the necessity of safeguarding and furthering public interests through war, whenever diplomacy fails to ward off threatened danger from rival states. The so-called police power, which includes the war power, is merely another name for sovereignty; by it is meant the power of the state to do anything needful for the safety and welfare of the nation. All other powers are simply implications arising from it. In general it may be said

that the claim to the use of force distinguishes the state from all other institutions of society.

Though primitive peoples in general have not advanced as far as the organization of the state, a number of them show clearly its beginnings and give evidence of the large part that war has played therein. In Africa the development of organization and of political headship as a result of war is especially well marked. War has here given birth to monarchies.³⁷

Among the Ethiopians, the need of military preparedness promoted organization and leadership, and the war leaders became the lords of the people.³⁸ In Abyssinia warfare has produced a social condition resembling the feudal system of medieval Europe. There are many princes, practically independent, who govern their subjects and maintain themselves by warfare. "They have feudatories, vassals forming the cadres of their armies, with which professional braves and freebooters will enroll themselves."³⁹

"The Azande chief is an important functionary both in time of peace and in the conduct of warfare. His rule is absolute almost to despotism; life and death are in his hands, nor does he neglect the exercise of these prerogatives."⁴⁰ Through the necessity of combining for war, the Bawenda have built up a complex system of government, with taxation and division of the country into districts or provinces under governors who are held closely responsible to the king.⁴¹ Under a powerful chief, Magato, the Mavenda tribe underwent political integration, and its population was constantly increased by accessions from subordinate tribes who recognized Magato as the paramount chief.⁴² The Baganda have a highly developed regulative system as a result of their success in the competition of life. Social classes are well marked. The king is an absolute monarch, holding in his hands the power of life and death. A mistake in etiquette toward him is punished by immediate death. He is the owner of all the land and can dispose of it as he likes. The country is divided into districts over which rule earls and lesser chiefs. Other officers assist the king, who lives in great state like a royal monarch.⁴³

The Ba-Yaka and their cannibal neighbors, the Ba-Mbala, present a contrast which strikingly brings out the rôle of war in the evolution of government. The latter people are governed by independent petty chiefs and possess an exceedingly loose social system which renders them incapable of anything like organized resistance. They often fight, but they wage no wars of occupation. They have slaves but treat them

with kindness, and the line between freeman and slave is very hazy indeed. The Ba-Yaka, on the contrary, wage wars of conquest and enslave the defeated tribes. Their slaves are treated with cruelty. They possess an organized government with feudal chiefs, ruled by one great chief. The people are considered by him as his slaves; on entering his presence they prostrate themselves and beat their breasts. His power is absolute. He is not assisted in the work of government by a council, though each village is administered by a petty chief. The two peoples have come into conflict, and, needless to say, the Ba-Mbala are unable to resist the encroachments of the Ba-Yaka.⁴⁴ The neighboring Ba-Yanzi have a political system of some development. They are governed by a number of great chiefs, each ruling over a number of petty chiefs. "The organization seems only to exist for the purposes of war." The Ba-Kwese are also governed by absolute chiefs who have derived their power from leadership in war.⁴⁵

Certain South African tribes reveal a considerable political development. The paramount chief is the ruler and military despot. His power is practically unlimited. Though usually guided by the advice of his council, he is recognized as above all law. He is the supreme judge and lawgiver, is surrounded with much pomp and ceremony, and is supposed to be attended by a guardian spirit.⁴⁶

Most of the powerful rulers of Africa are also revered as priests and even gods, a circumstance which adds greatly to their power. In these cases, the divinity that hedges a king is no empty form of speech. He is thought to be possessed of a great spirit and to be the mediator between the people and the spirit-realm. The prosperity of the people in time of peace and their success in time of war are held to be dependent upon his action.⁴⁷

The Zulus represent a classical case of the influence of war on political development. The Zulu kingdom is based on the organization of a large, disciplined standing army, which has been called "one of the most complete, most efficient, and most permanent organisations that negroes can show."⁴⁸ Its origin goes back to a Zulu chief who passed some years at Cape Colony where he learned something of European discipline. This he carried back to his own country and used to subdue the neighboring tribes, who, like most savages, were comparatively ignorant of discipline in war and were thus placed at a great disadvantage. The next Zulu chief, Tshaka, introduced better weapons and organized the army in its present

form, dividing the fighting men into regiments instead of tribes and enforcing the strictest discipline. His successors followed his general plan, making the interests of the army supreme in the ordering of the government. With their forces thus mobilized, the Zulus were able to conquer all their opponents and to establish a great military kingdom. Each conquered clan and tribe was absorbed into the Zulu nation by slaying or putting to flight all adult males, who were likely to be incorrigible upholders of their own tribal rights, and by adopting the younger males and females. This policy was effectual both in welding all the conquered peoples into a single nation and in concentrating and centralizing authority.⁴⁹

Another African example of a primitive state, likewise a product of war, was the military kingdom of Benin. It, too, had a disciplined standing army, with which it subjugated the surrounding tribes. The king acquired unlimited authority. The government and all property were vested in him alone. His subjects were his slaves, whom he could sell if he chose. He was regarded as a god and was obeyed and venerated as such.⁵⁰

The peoples of the Guinea Coast present an ascending series: the more warlike, the higher the political organization. The Yoruba-speaking peoples, who are relatively peaceful and devoted to trade, show only moderate integration. The monarchical system of government prevails, but the king is merely the nominal head of the state and has little real authority, which remains in the hands of the chiefs and elders, without whom the king can do nothing.⁵¹ The Tshi-speaking peoples, especially the conquering Ashantis, possess a more centralized and powerful government. The king is suzerain lord over all the chiefs of the tribe. The chiefs have organized the able-bodied men of their towns and dependent villages for war purposes into what are called town companies, and in time of war each chief takes the field in person with his own contingent. The king is not an absolute monarch, for he is always controlled to a certain extent by the chiefs. "The government is rather that of an aristocracy than a personal despotism, and the chiefs of districts, though feudatories of the king, preserve a species of semi-independence. The populace has no voice whatever

in the affairs of the tribe. Rule is maintained principally by terror, and the chief strength of the king lies in his power to take life at any time."⁵² The Ewe-speaking peoples represent the climax in this series, and their leading nation, the Dahomans, cannot be classed other than as a true state.

The king of Dahomey is an absolute monarch; his will is law, and he submits to no control whatsoever. All men are his slaves, and he personally owns all property. It is criminal to attempt to commit suicide, because every man is the property of the king. If any subject holds anything in his possession, it is only because the king tolerates it for the time being. The person of the king is sacred, and royal blood may not on any occasion be shed. The king, in short, is a personal despot in whom is centered such power as few rulers have ever enjoyed. His sovereignty is based on, and maintained by, a well-organized military system. He has at his command a large, well-disciplined standing army, whose interests he is careful to make identical with his own, and which blindly obeys all his commands. He has the power to take life at any moment, with or without reason, and is thus able to terrorize the populace. Finally, "in order to prevent conspiracies against him, the king has established a system of espionage which is so far-reaching that no man dare breathe to his dearest friend anything which might be twisted to his injury." Dahomey is a military kingdom, established by war and the slave trade and founded on the standing army. Under Trudo, its real founder, Dahomey conquered its weaker neighbors and gradually absorbed them. An exception to uncivilized peoples in general, it was well acquainted with effective conquest and subjugation.⁵³

Noteworthy, though less striking, examples of high political development, as a resultant of incessant warfare, are found among other primitive peoples. In Fiji, for instance, war increased the power of the chiefs, and conquest led to political integration. A significant contrast is here seen between different tribes. Among the mountain tribes of Vitilevu, who seldom extended their borders by conquest, the chief had but little power, being limited in all important matters by the power of the council of elders. Elsewhere, however, conquest ensued and put an end to the existence of tiny independent tribes. "From conquest sprung the great confederations. The chief of a conquering tribe rose to be

head of a complicated social body; the members of his tribe an aristocracy supported by the industry of an alien plebs composed of tribes they had conquered and fugitives from other conquerors. These too had their tribal gods and tribal chiefs, but what have men, reduced to open slavery, to do with such dignities? A generation of ill-usage sufficed to wipe out the very memory of independence. For god and chief alike they had their suzerain, upon whose indulgence their lives depended."⁵⁴

In Hawaii and elsewhere in Polynesia, the government was an arbitrary monarchy. The supreme authority was vested in the king and was hereditary in his family. Classes were well marked, and the people consisted largely of domestics and soldiers of the supreme chiefs.⁵⁵ Through wars of conquest the Maoris of New Zealand developed a rather complex social and political system. The people were divided into six well-recognized classes, with chiefs at the top and slaves at the bottom. Conquered tribes were enslaved or held as vassals.⁵⁶

A certain political development has taken place in India among the Chin Hill tribes. The relation of the Chin chief to his people is very similar to that of a feudal baron. "The chief is lord of the soil and his freemen hold it as his tenants and pay him tithes, whilst they in common with the slaves are bound to carry arms against all his enemies."⁵⁷ The Maos and the Kaupuis of Manipur present another telling contrast. "The whole of the Mao tribe is under one chief who receives tribute . . . from each family, and exercises the usual authority possessed by all monarchs or rajahs. . . . In this respect the Maos are very unlike the Kaupuis, where each village has its nominal hereditary chief, who is, however, powerless, the village being a miniature republic, and they are equally unlike the Angamis, where every village is broken up into two or more *khels* (kin-groups), each under its respective headman. Combination is thus possible amongst the Maos, but impossible with the Angamis, since nearly every *khel* has a feud with at least one other *khel* in one or more villages."⁵⁸

In the New World are found two striking illustrations of high regulative development as a product of war. The first is that of Mexico, where the Aztecs—the Romans of the New World—established a powerful military kingdom. The Mexican king, chosen from among the brethren of the defunct monarch and assisted by four delegates of the nobility, was an absolute ruler who was considered almost divine. Below him, and always near him, was a ruling class of military nobles. The rest of the population consisted of serfs and slaves.⁵⁹ The chief activity of the nation was war.

Montezuma himself was primarily a war chief, and war was the profession of the Aztec nobility.⁶⁰ The military organization was highly developed, embracing a standing army and a knowledge of tactics comparable to anything found in the Old World before the advent of gunpowder.⁶¹ The government was in fact a military despotism owing its development entirely to successful war and conquest.⁶²

The ancient Peruvians likewise possessed a highly integrated political organization. The kingdom was divided into four parts, each ruled by a viceroy. The monarch was not only absolute but divine, regarded as the lineal descendant of the sun, the supreme god. "High pontiff, the representative of the sun, he presided over the grand religious solemnities; generalissimo of the army, he levied and commanded his forces; absolute king, he imposed taxes, legislated, appointed or revoked all his functionaries and judges at will."⁶³ Below him came two privileged classes: the Incas or members of the royal family, descended from former kings, and the Curacas or rulers of the conquered provinces and their relatives. The latter were allowed to remain in possession of their offices, but were obliged to come from time to time to the capital, where they sent their children to be educated. At the bottom of the social scale were the common people. The Peruvian government was a result of, and its organization was directed toward, war and conquest. Every king felt it his mission to wage a perpetual crusade against all peoples who had not adopted the religion of the sun, and thus to extend the territory of his empire. The conquered were treated leniently and were assimilated by their conquerors. The remarkable military organization was based on compulsory military service and a standing army of 200,000 men. The army was clothed, armed, and provisioned out of public warehouses. The common people furnished the soldiers; the nobility, the leaders. The chief strength of the army lay in its numerous officers of the Inca clan, whose interests were identical with the king's. This class was sharply differentiated from the common people and was specially trained in the art of war. Military virtues were held in high honor and esteem. *Esprit de corps* was stimulated by permitting different regiments to wear distinctive uniforms and carry

special banners. Frontiers and subjugated provinces were defended by garrisons. Strategic points were guarded by fortresses. Pacification was effected by wholesale transplantations; colonies (*mitimaes*) of conquered tribes were settled in safe regions, and colonies of the dominant race were established in the subjugated provinces.⁶⁴

The Greeks of Homer's time had developed a political system of some complexity which likewise had its roots in war. "The Homeric king was pre-eminently a war-chief; he performed, upon the field of battle, to which he led his nation, the most conspicuous feats of bravery and military skill. . . . Military glory was so much worshipped that a successful fighter gained a certain claim to the throne." The king was leader in time of peace as well. He was the most powerful member of the society, the presiding officer at all gatherings of the nobles or the people, and the priest at public festivals. He was the guardian of the social order, the preserver of discipline and internal peace. In short, he was the government. The Homeric state was based upon a pyramid of classes: slaves, commoners, *hetairoi*, nobles, king. It existed for the purpose of maintaining peace within and waging war without.⁶⁵

The Iranians represent a similar stage of development. They were divided into a warrior nobility, priests, peasants, and slaves or subjugated enemies. They were ruled by a king in whom civil and military headship were united.⁶⁶ The Semitic tribes contained the germs of the monarchical state. The chief, who was essentially a military leader, was surrounded with the ceremony and pomp of a monarch. Slavery existed, and here and there a chief ruled despotically over a number of subjugated tribes. The nomadic and previously disunited Israelite tribes became a nation under Saul and David as the result of wars with the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, and Philistines. They conquered the aboriginal agricultural population, settled on their land, and laid the foundations of a true state.⁶⁷ In India the same course of development was followed. Warfare led to the emergence of a dominant warrior caste. Through conquest, warrior tribes like the Rajputs, Mahrattas and Marris, paved the way to political amalgamation.⁶⁸

The great empires of antiquity—Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia, Macedonia, Rome, and China—all owed their origin to war. War chiefs became kings. The warrior class developed into

aristocracies. Conquest was pursued on a large scale. Captives were made slaves, and tribute was exacted of conquered peoples. Cities were subjected to governors whose word was law. This political organization proceeded *pari passu* with increasing specialization in the military art. Even in Assyria the inscriptions and reliefs furnish abundant proof that considerable attention was paid to the science of warfare. "The secret of Assyrian, as of Roman, success in the battlefield is to be found in the military organization of the state."⁶⁹ This development finds its climax in Rome, which "created the first *imperium*, i.e., the first tensely centralized state on a large scale, and . . . thereby for all time set before the world the model of such an organized dominion."⁷⁰

The state, therefore, owes its origin to war. In very primitive societies it does not exist since its prerequisites are absent. "Neither density of population, developed agriculture, conquest, enslavement on the large scale, or private property in land belong to the earlier stages of societal development."⁷¹ The state normally arises from the conquest of a comparatively peaceful agricultural group by an invading nomadic war band. "Everywhere we find some warlike tribe of wild men breaking through the boundaries of some less warlike people, settling down as nobility and founding its State."⁷² The success of the invading host is rooted in its military superiority. But conquest does not lead to the formation of a state unless the conquered people is agricultural. "No permanent State was ever built, unaided, by an invading host, or even by a pastoral tribe; the State . . . cannot live unless it imposes itself on a solid basis of permanent agriculture, which will supply its needs by wealth drawn from the fruitful soil."⁷³ The development of agriculture lays the foundation for systematic enslavement.⁷⁴ Though made possible by agriculture, slavery is actually instituted by war. It appears with conquest as an alternative to slaughter or adoption, and is itself "the germ of the class-system."⁷⁵ "With the slaves emerges also the primary division into classes, a phenomenon characteristic of the state."⁷⁶ "Every state in history was or is a *state of classes*, a polity of superior and inferior social groups, based upon distinctions either of rank or of property."⁷⁷ "Such a class organization can come

about in one way only, namely, through conquest and the subjection of ethnic groups by the dominating group."⁷⁸ With conquest, the blood bond or kinship tie gives way to territoriality as the basis of political organization; "conquest is territorial as no preceding system of irregular raids and robberies, accompanied by massacre or adoption, could have been."⁷⁹ The concept of nationality arises from territoriality with the amalgamation of the various ethnic groups. Agriculture, slavery, and territoriality are thus the primary factors underlying state formation, but the force which actually welded them together to produce the state was war.

Increasing civilization has accompanied this political evolution. The state has united large numbers of people, and numbers and the contact of numbers are among the essential conditions for the rise of a higher civilization.⁸⁰ Contact promotes cultural exchange and stimulus; frequently the conquerors have taken over the culture of their subjects.⁸¹ The state has also furthered division of labor on a grand scale. It has introduced social differentiation in the form of slavery and sharply distinguished social classes. These imply a division of labor, through which the development of new arts and inventions is made possible. "The state is a product of force and exists by force,"⁸² and there is a strong element of force underlying the division of labor.⁸³ The performance of tasks necessary for the advancement of culture has thus been assured. Finally, the state has promoted internal peace and order, one of its chief functions throughout history.⁸⁴ Thus, though originally—and in many respects still—an instrument of exploitation, it has had a large share in the evolution of civilization.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MITIGATION OF WAR

AMONG very primitive peoples war is for the most part unregulated and unmitigated; there are no laws of warfare, no chivalry, no other customs which tend to lessen its cruelties. Women and children are slain, male prisoners are taken only to be tortured and killed, poisoned weapons are used, treachery is general, and no quarter is given. With increasing civilization; there appear certain restraining influences which relieve war of some of its barbarities. Two lines of development can be traced: a lessening of the severity of combat itself, and a growth of forces tending to prevent conflict from arising. These two lines will be discussed separately in this chapter and the next.

A declaration of war, our first example of mitigation, does not exist among the lowest peoples. The essence of savage warfare is treachery and ambush. Primitive military tactics consist of stratagem and surprise in attack. The enemy is approached under cover of darkness, surprised in the early morning when sound asleep, or attacked by daylight from ambush or concealment. This aversion of the savage to open fighting applies to war at sea. Sea fighting is rare, and where it does take place, stratagem is the usual method. These facts apply so generally to primitive tribes that it would be impracticable to attempt to review them.¹ Advanced peoples often adhere to the same tactics. In the warfare of the Homeric Greeks "ambushes were usual and were regarded as demanding special courage, particularly at night, when war was generally stopped."² The Hebrews often fought from ambush, made night marches, and attacked by stealth.³ Among the Arabs today, "the usual mode of warfare is to surprise by sudden attacks."⁴ In view of these facts, a declaration of war constitutes a distinct advance. Its obvious effect is to give the enemy a chance, and conversely it deprives the attacking party of certain advantages afforded by surprise. It introduces, therefore, a sort of chivalry. Since

primitive peoples possess no written language, the declaration is conveyed by messengers or by the employment of conventional symbols. In Appendix L have been assembled our cases of the declaration of war and of the particular symbols used.

Another example of the mitigation of war is seen in customs prescribing the weapons and methods by which it shall be conducted and providing that the dispute be decided by champions or by the parties principally concerned. The small war (*Kutana*) of the Ba-Mbala, already mentioned in another connection, represents such a tendency.⁵ It is a means of settling a dispute by the only known method and at the same time of alleviating its severity. Such practices are particularly common in intragroup disputes. Thus the Bangala fight amongst themselves only with sticks. All their family quarrels which cannot be adjusted by the ordeal or by palaver are fought out in this manner. The party which is driven from the "field" is accounted the loser; it then pays up and the affair ends.⁶ Among the Papuans of Torres Straits similar ceremonial fights are the usual method of settling quarrels involving more than two people. As soon as one person has received a blow with a tomahawk the fighting ceases and friendship is restored.⁷

In Australia, single combats often take the place of pitched battles as a means of deciding intergroup as well as intragroup disagreements. If a man wounds a fellow tribesman, he is often required by custom to allow the injured party to inflict a similar wound on him. Cases of elopement, wife-stealing, and the like, instead of involving different clans in war, are settled by a fight between the two men principally concerned. A group of natives generally forms around the combatants to assure fair play. As a rule no one is seriously injured. Frequently a person accused of murder or witchcraft is subjected to a sort of trial by battle. He is given a shield to defend himself; every man throws a weapon at him; if he manages to ward them off successfully, he is freed of the charges. In general, no matter what the offense, a single combat or legalized fight is the normal way of ending a quarrel. The fighting stops when blood is drawn. Since the combat decides the dispute, no blood feud is inaugurated, and thus further bloodshed is prevented.⁸ Quarrels between tribes are frequently decided by the same means. The offense is most commonly elopement or the theft of a woman from an-

other tribe. The offender is given a shield, and the woman's kinsmen throw weapons at him; if he comes out unscathed, he has a right to keep her. Sometimes a single combat between the woman-stealer and a champion from her tribe takes the place of this ordeal. In case the friends on either side get restive and interfere, the fight becomes general and plunges the two groups into actual war.⁹ Frequently intertribal disputes over hunting-grounds and trespasses on them are settled by a single combat, usually between the chiefs, and the result is accepted as final. At other times disputes are decided by combat between equal numbers of warriors.¹⁰ Persons accused of wrongdoing occasionally receive notice to appear before the assembled tribes and be tried, on pain of being outlawed and killed. A person so accused goes to the meeting armed with two spears, a shield, and a boomerang. If he is found guilty, he is placed opposite the injured person and his friends, who hurl their spears at him and then engage him singly. "As blood must be spilt to satisfy the injured party, the trial ends on his being hit."¹¹

Single combats often occurred between chiefs of opposing forces among the Maoris. Within the tribe itself, individual "affairs of honor," mainly over women, were frequent. The combat was conventionalized. The aggrieved person made three thrusts with his spear at the offender's breast while the latter crouched on one knee. If the accused succeeded in parrying the blows, he got up, and the two fought on equal terms. "As soon as one was wounded the duel was over, but if either of the combatants received fatal injury one of his relatives would claim 'satisfaction,' and a general *mêlée* ensue."¹² The peaceful Eskimos have found a similar way of mitigating intergroup conflict. When two strange bodies of Eskimos meet, each party selects a champion, and the two strike each other on the side of the head or the bared shoulders until one gives in.¹³ Tribe does not fight against tribe, but—and this applies even when whole tribes are at variance—a few selected champions meet each other.¹⁴

Among the Tlingits, "trial by combat is frequently resorted to, not only to determine private disputes, but to settle quarrels between petty tribes. In the latter case, each side chooses a champion, the warriors place themselves in battle array, the combatants armed with their favorite weapon, the dagger, and well armored, step forth and engage in fight; while the people on either side engage in song and dance during the combat."¹⁵ The Columbians usually settled quarrels between individuals, towns, and tribes by single combat.¹⁶ Along the northern Pacific coast differences between villages were often set at rest by ap-

pointing a day for fighting, when the people of both sides arrayed themselves in their hide and wooden armor and engaged in a pitched battle, the issue being decided by the fall of one or two prominent men.¹⁷ Among the Botocudos of Brazil, any encroachment on the hunting-grounds of another tribe led to altercations, but these were usually settled by a sort of duel between the champions of the respective factions. The pair of warriors would belabor one another with heavy staves till one gave in. If, however, the losing tribe took to their bows and arrows, the scene would change into a real battle.¹⁸

Homer relates a splendid example of a single combat of this type. The Greeks and Trojans, under solemn oaths and truce, agreed to let the war be decided by a duel between the injured Menelaus and the seducer Paris.¹⁹ David and Goliath furnish a parallel instance among the Hebrews.²⁰

Another mitigation of war appeared when women and children were spared. Many savage tribes make no distinction of age or sex during the heat of a fray. In fact, this is almost the general rule, and only a few illustrative instances are necessary. The Ama-Xosa of South Africa murder women and children without distinction.²¹ The Fang think it quite proper to shoot a woman; they even say: "It is always *safe* to shoot a woman because she cannot shoot back."²² When the Sea Dyaks of Borneo are on the warpath they spare neither men, women, nor children.²³ Nearly all the head-hunting tribes of Borneo and elsewhere make no distinction of age or sex in their eagerness to win war honors and trophies.

During a blood feud in Torres Straits no quarter is given, and women are abused and murdered.²⁴ In war many Polynesian tribes make no distinction in regard to either women or children.²⁵ In their blood feuds the Garo Hill tribes of Bengal wreak revenge on all alike.²⁶ The Eskimos about Bering Strait frequently put women to death and even killed infants, to prevent them from growing up into enemies.²⁷ The Haidas were "unmercifully cruel to all sexes and ages in the heat of battle."²⁸ The Indians of California took special pains to kill the women of their enemies when at war; "they say that one woman destroyed is equivalent to five men, because they have such trouble with their own."²⁹ The Pimas of New Mexico spared neither sex nor age during the heat of battle, and the same was true of the tribes of northern Mexico.³⁰ Women and children were often slain in the wars

of the Hebrews.³¹ They were killed in Arab warfare until Mohammed forbade it.³² "The nomad Mongolians still slaughter their prisoners without any distinction as to age or sex."³³

In face of these facts, it was a great humanitarian advance when women and children were spared. The Ba-Huana, who take no prisoners and grant no quarter, nevertheless make an exception in the case of women, whom they keep in captivity until the end of the war.³⁴ The Masai, who slay every man and boy, rarely kill women.³⁵ The Kaffirs spare the lives of women and children.³⁶ The Oromó do likewise and even include merchants and priests.³⁷ Among the Bageshu, "the women may always go where they wish and never meet with any opposition even when the clans are at war one with the other."³⁸ The Guanches of the Canary Islands held it "base and mean to molest or injure the women and children of the enemy, considering them as weak and helpless, therefore improper objects of their resentment."³⁹

Though the natives of Torres Straits spared neither sex nor age in blood feuds, they made an exception on head-hunting forays, when they did not kill or capture women nor violate them. "If a man was caught in the act of doing the latter he would be told, 'We came out to fight, not to do that,' and he would be killed."⁴⁰ The Samoans considered it cowardly to kill a woman.⁴¹ During the war between the Europeans and Tasmanians, in which the native women were frequently victims of the brutality of the Europeans, the Tasmanians did not outrage a single white woman though they surprised many of them in their isolated dwellings.⁴²

Children are spared in the wars of the Kukis.⁴³ The state of constant feud among the Angami and other Naga tribes is somewhat mitigated by the custom of sparing the women. "In these intestine wars the women of the contending parties visit each other at their different villages without fear of molestation."⁴⁴ Respect toward the weaker sex is also asserted of the Winnebagoes and of the Sioux Indians, and the Abipones are said to have "spared the unwarlike, and carried away innocent boys and girls unhurt."⁴⁵

In time of foreign war the Homeric Greeks slew the men but spared the women and children, whom they carried off as slaves.⁴⁶ The Bedouins are gallant toward the female sex. "Whether camps are plundered by day or by night, the women are generally treated with respect; so far, at least, that their honour is never violated. . . . Sometimes, however,

in case of inveterate hostility, they may be stripped of their ornaments, which the plunderers oblige them to take off themselves. This rule is invariably observed by the Wahábys whenever they obtain possession of an enemy's camp: they order the females to strip off whatever articles of clothes or valuable trinkets they may happen to wear; and during this time they stand at some distance from the women, to whom they turn their backs."⁴⁷

Certain other customs regulative of warfare among savage peoples seem to show some evidence of chivalry. The Khonds, before beginning a war, allow the enemy time to complete a religious ceremony in appeal for the war god's coöperation in the coming struggle. They themselves perform a similar rite.⁴⁸ In the Canary Islands, in time of war, places of worship were not molested.⁴⁹ The Peruvians exacted from the conquered nothing more than submission to their will, and the gods of the defeated party were not treated with disrespect.⁵⁰ The Kaffirs refrain from starving out the enemy.⁵¹ The Fijians spared the fruit trees of their adversaries unless their obduracy greatly prolonged the war.⁵² The Lushais, who prosecuted war by raiding the villages of their enemies, nevertheless held the practice of waylaying people while cultivating to be unfair.⁵³ "To ambush cultivators was considered unsporting," writes Colonel Shakespear⁵⁴ of them, "for as a chief said to me, 'How can people live if cultivation is impossible?'" In certain parts of New Guinea, "should a woman throw her petticoat over a wounded man, he is safe from further molestation."⁵⁵ The Maoris scorned to strike an enemy when surprised asleep, and in action they frequently displayed chivalry toward one another.⁵⁶ Smyth⁵⁷ says of the aborigines of Victoria: "Their mode of warfare is fair, open, and manly; for tribes on hostile terms scorn to take the least undue advantage of each other, and the instant a fight is concluded, both parties seem perfectly reconciled and jointly assist in tending the wounded men." The desire of some Australian tribes to equalize the chances is so strong that they have been known to give arms to unarmed Europeans before proceeding to attack them.⁵⁸

Many primitive tribes poison their weapons to render them more deadly.⁵⁹ This may be due to the fact that their arms are

otherwise very ineffective. Superior weapons, such as the sword or gun, by displacing inferior ones, put an end to the use of poison. It is significant, however, that some tribes possessing inferior weapons nevertheless refrain from poisoning them.

The Tangale, for instance, poison their weapons for elephant-hunting but not for fighting.⁶⁰ The Nagas seldom poisoned their arrows, and a Naga once told Holcombe that "it was not at all the correct thing to use a poisoned arrow, unless, indeed it was fired at a woman."⁶¹ The Code of Manu prohibited the use of poisoned arrows.⁶² The Aztecs did not poison their arrows because they desired to take prisoners rather than slay the enemy. They disdained poisoned arrows and used them only for shooting birds.⁶³ Among the Homeric Greeks "the sanction of the gods intervened to stop indiscriminate slaughter and the use of poisoned weapons; the story goes that Odysseus made a journey to get poison for his arrows, but the man to whom he applied would not give the poison, 'since (of course) he revered the everliving gods.'"⁶⁴

Certain other rules of war suggest a condemnation of treachery and a notion that some tactics are unfair. Thus when two horsemen among opposing Bedouin cavalry challenge one another and begin to fight, "none of the bystanders join in this combat, to do so would be reckoned a treacherous action." The Aenezes never attack by night; this they regard as *boag* or treachery.⁶⁵ The Laws of Manu prescribe a definite code of warfare. Besides prohibiting the use of poisoned arrows, it enjoins that the disarmed, the wounded, and those who surrender shall be spared. "The man on horseback, or in a war-chariot, must not kill the soldier on foot. It is forbidden to attack anyone overcome by fatigue, him who is asleep or lying down, the soldier in flight, or one who is already engaged against an adversary. The conquered country ought to be respected. Security ought to be guaranteed to all its inhabitants; neither the laws nor the religion of the conquered people ought to be altered."⁶⁶ The Khonds of Madras became insubordinate a few years ago, and a police force was sent against them; they prepared stones to roll down the hill in front of their village, but left the rear unguarded, and when the police entered by the rear the Khonds protested against the unfairness of this movement after they had taken such precautions in front.⁶⁷ Hale⁶⁸ explains the tortures inflicted by the Iroquois as due to their de-

sire to mark some kinds of warfare as very abominable and so to drive them out of use. Chinese tactics are in certain details several stages removed from savage treachery. "At Ning-Po, in 1842, when the Chinese soldiers made an attack upon English troops, they were careful to carry lighted lanterns upon their heads. In 1857 they remained in their trenches, quite uncovered from the fire of balls and bullets, or else in their junks, until they were forced into hand-to-hand combat, or until a large battery of fire was turned upon them. Then they surrendered, indignantly angry at the disloyalty of their enemies."⁶⁹ Naïve as many of these examples may appear to us today, they nevertheless represent a considerable advance over unregulated savage warfare.

The state of incessant intergroup hostility in which so many primitive tribes find themselves and in which a man's life is in danger the moment he leaves his group, has been somewhat improved by customs holding inviolable the messengers and ambassadors of the different tribes. "Every tribe in Australia has its messenger, whose life, whilst he is in the performance of his duties, is held sacred in peace and war by the neighbouring tribes."⁷⁰ These envoys are usually old men, well known to the various tribes, though frequently women are employed in the same capacity. The messengers carry news from tribe to tribe and make appointments to meet for hunting, dancing, fighting, or settling disputes.⁷¹ When there is a misunderstanding between tribes, the ambassadors are usually women. "Women were chosen for these messages because they would not be treacherously made away with as might be the case with men. . . . The members of the mission are treated as distinguished guests. Food is provided for them by their hosts, and on their return home after about a week's stay they are loaded with presents."⁷²

These Australian couriers frequently carry notched sticks, known as message sticks, as an aid to memory. It is always possible to tell by the appearance of the messenger what kind of news he bears, whether of death, of fighting, of elopements, or other events. If the message relates to a corroboree, he carries a kilt; if to an expiatory fight, a shield; to the assembling of a war-party, a jag spear; to initiation ceremonies, a bull-roarer.⁷³ The

messengers are considered sacred while on duty and pass freely and unharmed among tribes even in times of war. If a native is employed as a white man's messenger, he receives the same immunity. In this case the message is usually written on a piece of paper which is fixed in the end of a split stick. "Carrying this before him, he might pass safely through an enemy's country, because he was seen to be the white man's messenger, and if any harm were done to him, the tribe of the white man would be very angry."⁷⁴ The inviolability of messengers is sanctioned by force, for it is considered a heinous crime to kill a messenger, and the deed is speedily avenged.⁷⁵ So firmly established is the custom, however, that only very exceptionally is a messenger molested.⁷⁶ In short, the office is in every way comparable to that of an ambassador, herald, or bearer of a flag of truce among civilized nations.

In Oceania intertribal intercourse is likewise conducted through inviolable heralds, old women for choice, though the practice is not so well developed as in Australia.⁷⁷ In Samoa, during war, messages of all kinds are conveyed by women, who are even allowed to pass freely from camp to camp.⁷⁸ In New Guinea women serve as ambassadresses between belligerents.⁷⁹ Among the Nigerian head-hunters, "when one side is tired of the war, women of the other tribe married to men of the former tribe are sent to their relatives with offers of peace. They are naturally sacred, for they have friends on both sides."⁸⁰ Among the Ba-Huana, the chief is employed as an ambassador, and his person is respected by the enemy.⁸¹ Among the Ewe-speaking tribes, "the stick of office, usually silver-headed, is regarded as the sign of authority, and the same honours and respect are paid to the stick as to the person to whom it belongs. It has almost sacred character, and it is an unheard of crime for an ambassador, furnished with this emblem, to be molested. This, in a country where communication is difficult and hazardous, and life insecure, guarantees the safe transmission of important messages."⁸²

Intertribal messengers among the American Indians found in wampum a well-recognized passport.⁸³ Each village, moreover, had its calumet or pipe of peace, and whoever traveled with it passed with impunity even amongst the enemy.⁸⁴ The Nahua nations of Mexico had a complete courier system. The couriers were employed to carry messages in peace and in war; they wore badges and were dressed in a

manner indicative of the intelligence entrusted to them. Ambassadors were also employed by the Mexicans. "Their persons were held sacred and they were usually received by those to whom they were sent with honor and respect, perfumed with incense, presented with flowers, and well lodged and entertained; in case any insult or indignity was offered them, it constituted a sufficient cause of war."⁸⁵ The Hebrews often sent ambassadors, who were usually held inviolable but were occasionally imprisoned.⁸⁶ Among the early Greeks the regular means of communication between hostile armies was by heralds who "passed freely from camp to camp, and were evidently under a tabu, their persons were sacred and easily recognisable; they were called 'divine.'" Ambassadors were similarly respected.⁸⁷

The savagery of warfare is also mitigated by the recognition of neutrals or noncombatants. Among primitive peoples the smith very often enjoys this immunity. Smiths are frequently regarded with superstitious awe and are left unharmed for this reason as well as for the purpose of deriving advantage from their special knowledge. Their residences are generally neutral ground.⁸⁸ The Eskimos about Bering Strait recognized noncombatants in certain cases. "When a man on either side had relatives in the opposing party, and for this reason did not wish to take part in the battle, he would blacken his face with charcoal and remain a noncombatant, both sides respecting his neutrality. In this event, a man with his face blackened had the privilege of going without danger among the people of either side during a truce."⁸⁹ The Bakongo of Africa also respect neutrality when it is labeled; "a new palm-frond shaken out, and put in a prominent place on a house or on a town, is used by a person or a town to indicate absolute neutrality in any local war, and ensures respect by the antagonists."⁹⁰

Among the Babunda of Africa, "white men or their servants are, as a rule, allowed to travel through districts where a state of war exists without any molestation whatever, for the natives are quite content to keep their differences to themselves, and strictly respect the neutrality of the white man."⁹¹ Cruel as is Berber warfare, in which all male prisoners are put to death, it is nevertheless mitigated by the exemption of one class, namely, the Moroccan Jews. The Jews enjoy immunity from robbery and pillage in spite of the fact that no effective government exists. "In their

case, an ancient system known as 'debéha,' or 'sacrifice,' is in vogue. In plain words, the ancestors of Jewish families have, by means of a 'sacrifice,' fallen under the actual protection of certain Berber families who guarantee them from ill-treatment or robbery in return for a certain annual payment. Any injury to the Jew is looked upon as a personal matter, and the protecting Berber takes up the quarrel as if it were his own. The system is excellent, and the Jews reside in greater security in these wild regions than is the case where lawless Arabs rob and ill-treat them in other parts of Morocco."⁹² This purchased immunity recalls similar practices in medieval Europe.

Some primitive tribes also recognize neutral territory. When the Luhupa of India quarreled, "the hostile parties confined themselves by mutual agreement to certain fixed bounds within which they might kill one another."⁹³ In Efáte, New Hebrides, when war was declared, "certain paths were arranged to be 'paths of peace,' or neutral ground, and the remainder of the country was 'dangerous,'"⁹⁴ a sort of "no man's land." The Australians, with their fondness for large gatherings, found it necessary to restrict the area in which fighting might be carried on. They accordingly established on the banks of the Gregory a neutral section, 150 miles long by 50 wide, which was reserved, by the common consent of the several tribes, for the holding of meetings.⁹⁵ Since fighting interferes with trading, the Ba-Mbala of Africa established markets on neutral ground between several villages.⁹⁶ The tribes of the Loango Coast set aside as neutral territory an island, Ilongo, where valuable possessions could be stored and protected and where anyone was free to till the land unmolested.⁹⁷ The Fuegians of Cape Horn established a neutral ground between their hordes; this operated to rob war of some of its destructiveness and to make armed conflicts less frequent.⁹⁸ The ancient Mexicans restricted fighting to a special field—always left uncultivated—in each province.⁹⁹ All these cases represent efforts to limit the inconveniences of war in the interests of better adaptation.

Savage warfare is not always to the bitter end, with no quarter given and no negotiation for peace allowed. Truces are made, and signs and symbols are used to designate peaceful intentions. Fur-

thermore, they are respected. Among the Eskimos about Bering Strait, "if a fight lasted a long time, so that both parties became tired and hungry or sleepy, a fur coat would be waved on a stick by one side as a sign of truce, during which both parties would rest, eat, or sleep, and then renew the conflict."¹⁰⁰ The tribes which Catlin visited in North America held a white flag of skin or bark as the inviolable symbol of truce.¹⁰¹ The Utes hoisted a deerskin in token of peace; the Indians at the mouth of the Mississippi indicated their peaceful and friendly purposes by holding aloft a small stick of whitened wood.¹⁰² Among the Ojibwa, Omaha, Sioux, and many other tribes, the calumet or pipe was the symbol of peace and was used instead of a flag of truce. It was carried by ambassadors when making overtures of peace, and "the bearer of a peace pipe was generally respected by the enemy, just as the bearer of a flag of truce is regarded by the laws of war among the so-called civilized nations."¹⁰³

The Yucatecs of Central America expressed to the Spaniards a desire for a suspension of hostilities by throwing away their weapons and by kissing their fingers after touching them to the ground.¹⁰⁴ As a ceremony of submission after defeat and an offer of peace, the Nagas of India take a handful of earth and grass, and, after placing it on the head, put it on the edge of a dagger and chew it between the lips—"one of the most literal and disagreeable renderings of the metaphorical term 'eating dirt.'"¹⁰⁵ On the road to Niao, in the Jaipur district, Woodthorpe¹⁰⁶ saw on the ground a curious mud figure of a man in slight relief presenting a gong in the direction of Senua. "This was supposed to show that the Niao men were willing to come to terms with Senua, then at war with Niao. Another mode of evincing a desire to turn away the wrath of an approaching enemy, and induce him to open negotiations, is to tie up in his path a couple of goats, sometimes also a gong, with the universal symbol of peace, a palm leaf planted in the ground hard by."

The Masai use grass as a sign of truce, and "part of the equipment of the women is a bunch of grass, which they fasten to their cowhide belts or under some of their iron rings, in order to have it at hand when an occasion arises to manifest amity."¹⁰⁷ The Baganda offer spears and shields made of plantain stems as tokens of surrender.¹⁰⁸ Among the Akikuyu spitting on the hands is a sign of peace.¹⁰⁹ In Fiji different modes of treating for peace prevail. In some districts whales' teeth are

a measure of value and a sign of peace; in others a basket of earth is presented to the conquerors in suing for a cessation of hostilities.¹¹⁰ In parts of New Guinea, when one side desires peace, arrows are shot in the air in view of the enemy or are broken, or else green branches are waved in the hands.¹¹¹ Among the many different signs of peace used by the Papuans are chewing or exchanging betel nut and laying sago-cake and fruit at the feet of the conqueror.¹¹² In Torres Straits, holding a coconut in one hand and a green bough in the other is an indication that peace is desired.¹¹³ Among the Yakuts, the distribution of kumiss and meat served as a symbol of peace and of friendship.¹¹⁴

The rules of war among the Maoris permitted truces now and then. "If a fort was surrounded and besieged, it was no uncommon thing for members of the attacking party to pay visits to the beleaguered camp, where their lives were quite safe, as a rule."¹¹⁵ When one side desired peace it would send a herald, related to both parties, to the other side to negotiate. His flag of truce was the green branch of a tree.¹¹⁶ In south-eastern Australia, where sign-language is prevalent, certain gestures indicate that the approaching party has peaceful intentions.¹¹⁷ Hoisting green boughs or sending bundles of red ocher are signs of peace in central Australia.¹¹⁸ Truces were frequent among the early Greeks and were concluded with sacred oaths and a sort of foundation-sacrifice.¹¹⁹ Reference is twice made in the *Iliad* to agreements between besiegers and besieged that a city be spared and half of its possessions given to the enemy. "This was better for the people of the city than to lose everything, and to be led into captivity themselves, and it well might be more profitable to the assailants than to risk an assault in which their own loss might be considerable, and the treasures of the city would in large part be destroyed."¹²⁰ In the catacombs of Rome, the dove is represented as the emblem of peace, and it has the same symbolic meaning today.¹²¹

Treaties of peace are made, and on the whole faithfully kept, by many primitive tribes. They are invariably concluded with impressive ceremonies, for, in the absence of written language or other methods of recording events, it becomes necessary to impress their terms vividly on the memory of the contracting parties. The Nandi of Uganda, in making peace, use a donkey's skull, which is alternately chopped with an axe by each of the high contracting parties. "After this chopping, speeches are delivered in which both sides declare that those who break the peace shall be destroyed as the skull is being smashed." The Masai and Lumbwa once con-

cluded peace by the exchange of a Lumbwa baby for a Masai baby; each mother thereafter reared the other's infant. "This was thought to be the most permanent way that could be devised of making a lasting peace."¹²² When two contending clans of the Bageshu wish to make peace, "the chiefs come together to some place and sit down, a dog is brought and one takes hold of its head and the other of its hind legs, whilst a third man severs it in two with a large knife. The dog is thrown away and the clans are free to intermingle without any fear."¹²³ In other parts of Africa, treaties of peace are impressed on the minds of the former foes by the sacrifice of an animal, usually a sheep or a goat, with accompanying ceremonies.¹²⁴ In South Africa peace is ratified by an exchange of goats and oxen.¹²⁵ The Kavirondo conclude peace at the foot of a sacred tree. The treaty is thus given a religious sanction, and whichever party breaks it incurs the wrath of the spirits.¹²⁶

The Hawaiians and Tahitians make a wreath of green boughs and deposit it in the temple, invoking a curse on the first side that violates the peace and forgets the reconciliation.¹²⁷ In concluding peace between hostile tribes, the Sea Dyaks construct a large wooden image of the hornbill and festoon it with cigarettes, which are removed during the ceremony and solemnly smoked by all the men present.¹²⁸ In other parts of Borneo peace is concluded by an exchange of beads and other precious articles, accompanied by a sham fight.¹²⁹ The payment of pigs is the usual sign of reconciliation between two villages in the New Hebrides. The ceremony often takes the form of a sham fight in which the village that must pay the pigs is defeated, thus giving a conventional pretext for the payment.¹³⁰ Treaties of peace are sealed among the Papuans by eating, drinking, and smoking together, as well as by the sacrifice of dogs or other animals.¹³¹ In Timor, restoration of the heads captured by each side in war is a condition of peace. Friendship is cemented by a boisterous feast, concluded by heavy drinking and wild dancing.¹³²

The Angami of India, in swearing peace, place the barrel of a gun or a spear between their teeth, signifying by this ceremony that if they do not live up to the agreement they are prepared to fall by either of the two weapons. Sometimes emissaries from either side meet, exchange spears, and drink together, whereupon a fowl is killed and peace finally concluded.¹³³ In the Naga hills the chiefs of the two sides may declare peace by drinking to each other.¹³⁴ Among the Maoris, the opposing

chiefs exchanged the *mere*, a flat club, as a pledge of peace and amity.¹³⁵ The Guanches of the Canary Islands kept treaties faithfully, and "the shameless treachery of the foreigners was a source of great amazement to their uncultured foes."¹³⁶

Among the American Indians, treaties of peace were usually arranged by ambassadors from the hostile tribes, who brought with them the pipe of peace or calumet. The pipe was passed solemnly from mouth to mouth, each person blowing the smoke in certain directions and muttering vows at the same time. In some instances presents were exchanged, and the ceremonies terminated with a feast of several days' duration.¹³⁷ Wampum was also used for the same purpose, and it had the virtue of being a more permanent record of the treaty.¹³⁸ Hiawatha is said to have invented, not wampum, but the woven belt as a credential for his ambassadors of peace.¹³⁹ Wampum was frequently used, especially by the Hurons and the Iroquois, to record treaties of peace not only among themselves but with the whites as well. Many of the old treaty belts are still extant; the designs and symbols worked on them show the nature and conditions of the various agreements.¹⁴⁰

Treaties were not regarded by the Indians as "scraps of paper;" they were sacred and taboo, having the sanction of the gods.¹⁴¹ The Indians broke faith very rarely. "The formal exchange among the Indian nations of documents so constructed and inscribed as to be permanent records of treaty compacts, is a custom which could only have arisen in communities among whom the keeping of good faith was a general habit and in public matters a confirmed tradition." The Four-Nations Alliance Belt, for instance, which records a treaty between the Wyandots and three Algonquian tribes, shows the strength of a treaty established by the solemnity of a wampum belt, in that "this compact remained in force among the four nations, in spite of wars and changes of government among their white protectors, and through all the turmoil and confusion of Pontiac's conspiracy, in which all the Indians were more or less engaged, for over a hundred years, from the first decade of the eighteenth to the fourth decade of the present century." The Indians, moreover, kept faith with the whites, who have not always shown them the same integrity. The Iroquois

maintained the "covenant chain" with the British unbroken for a round century, and the treaty made with Penn actually established a "firm and lasting peace" as the Penn Wampum Belt intended.¹⁴²

Another grand case of the mitigation of war is seen in the treatment of prisoners. Among some savage tribes no prisoners of war are taken, and women and children are slain. "*Moku na Katikati*," "Slay the women and children," was a maxim with the Fijians, whose object in war was to crush the enemy beyond the power of retaliation and to keep the women and children from breeding avengers to harass them later.¹⁴³ Negro warfare in general "aims at the most practical object, keeping in view the destruction of the foe. Hence the small value set upon human life makes itself truly conspicuous."¹⁴⁴ The Omaha never took prisoners. "He aimed to kill his enemy, not to take him captive. . . . War meant devastation."¹⁴⁵ Many other tribes take no prisoners or take them only to eat or sacrifice them.¹⁴⁶ The first mitigation of this savagery came, as we have seen, when women and children were spared. Hence women and children were the first prisoners of war. Indeed, primitive warfare seems to be characterized in general by the fact that the men are slain and the women and children carried off into captivity. The cases where this occurs range in civilization from the naked savage to peoples of considerable culture.¹⁴⁷

Tribes not sufficiently advanced to hold slaves commonly practice adoption. In this way they are able to some extent to compensate for their own losses in war. Those adopted are usually children, for they are more amenable than adults and more liable to become faithful members of the tribe.

The Kukis in their wars spared only children, whom they adopted.¹⁴⁸ "As a general rule the Mekeo tribes did not make prisoners of war, and it appeared that when an exception was made, the captives were always young children who would be adopted into the village of their captor."¹⁴⁹ The Dyaks often spared no one, but sometimes exempted and adopted children.¹⁵⁰ The Kurnai at times showed mercy to children and adopted them.¹⁵¹

Adopted children are usually treated well, like full members of the tribe. Among the Andamanese, for example, "a child which might be captured uninjured would meet with kindly treatment, in the hope of

his (or her) being induced ultimately to become a member of the captor's tribe."¹⁵² The Abipones treated their captive children "with kindness and indulgence."¹⁵³ The Charruas are said to have been so humane to the Spanish women and children whom they captured and adopted that "it is remarkable how often the Spanish authors record the unwillingness of their country-women both here and elsewhere in South America, when rescued from the Indians, to return to their own people."¹⁵⁴ Bancroft ¹⁵⁵ says of the wild tribes of Mexico: "Young children were sometimes spared, and reared to fight in the ranks of their conquerors; and in order to brutalize their youthful minds and eradicate all feelings of affection toward their own kindred, the youthful captives were given to drink the brains and blood of their murdered parents." The Minuanes and Puelches in South America at times adopted instead of killing their prisoners.¹⁵⁶ Adoption following capture was common among the North American Indians, especially among the tribes of the eastern woodlands where slavery was less prevalent, and the adopted children were treated as regular members of the tribe.¹⁵⁷

The usual fate of captured men is death, yet occasionally they, too, are spared. In early Virginia it was customary before a war to send a message to the hostile force to the effect that, in the event of their defeat, all who submitted within two days should live.¹⁵⁸ In New Caledonia, "some small sparks of humanity are beginning to appear; if in the middle of a battle, for instance, a chief desires that any particular life may be spared, that individual will be respected. The same prisoner may afterwards be adopted, if the chief gives his consent."¹⁵⁹ The Maoris of New Zealand had a somewhat similar custom. The chief of the winning side could call out the names of certain warriors among the enemy, who, if they accepted the invitation, joined the victors and were treated as visitors and highly honored guests, not as prisoners.¹⁶⁰

The right of asylum affords another means whereby male enemies may be spared. Among the Osages, if a foe slipped into the camp and begged the chief for protection, the latter was obliged to help the suppliant. When the fugitive had eaten a mouthful of the food in the chief's kettle, he was safe. "He could then go through the camp with impunity. This condition of affairs lasted as long as he remained with the tribe, but it terminated when he returned to his home."¹⁶¹ Among some Indian tribes a particular

village or clan had the right to shelter or protect a fugitive; among others the chief's tent afforded asylum.¹⁶² In West Africa, "it was an ancient and universal custom that a refugee, by clasping the knees of the king of any other tribe, could claim his protection. The king was bound to accept the claim. The obligation he thus assumed was sacred."¹⁶³ Among the Lushai of India the chief's house was an asylum.¹⁶⁴ The Hawaiians established places of refuge in which enemies were always sure of finding protection.¹⁶⁵ Among primitive peoples the right of sanctuary frequently attaches to the grave of a chief. Thus in the Tonga Islands, Kaffirland, British East Africa, and parts of West Africa, the grave of a chief or the temple built over it offers asylum, where the refugee is free from molestation, his immunity being sanctioned by the resident ghost.¹⁶⁶

The first move in the direction of making male enemies prisoners instead of slaughtering them was scarcely a mitigation of the cruelties of war, for the captives were tortured and mutilated. This is particularly the case among tribes not sufficiently advanced to hold slaves. Not knowing how to utilize their captives, they torture them for amusement and other reasons. This might appear less savage than killing and eating them, but, since the torture usually ends in the death of the victim, there is little if any alleviation. Numerous examples of torturing prisoners of war are cited in Appendix M.

Some tribes which habitually torture their prisoners nevertheless have certain customs, some of them chivalrous, by which the cruelties are abated. Some tribes in Africa and North America exchange prisoners instead of killing them.¹⁶⁷ A more usual practice is to hold them for ransom, and if not ransomed to slay them. This occurs occasionally in New Guinea, Central America, and elsewhere, frequently in Africa and North America, and it was a regular practice among the Homeric Greeks.¹⁶⁸ The American Indians had other customs by which captives were saved from torture and their lives spared. Thus, in the lower Mississippi Valley, sometimes "a young woman who may have lost her husband in war, seeing the victim when he arrives entirely naked and without means of concealing his defects, if he has any, demands him for

her husband, and he is granted to her on the spot."¹⁶⁹ Although the Shoshones habitually tortured their captives to death, "male prisoners who have distinguished themselves by their prowess in battle, are frequently dismissed unhurt."¹⁷⁰

Sometimes the captive is given a chance for freedom. Many Indian tribes subjected their captives to ordeals and spared their lives if they survived. Frequently the ordeal took the form of what is known as running the gauntlet. The prisoner was forced to run between two lines of warriors armed with clubs, tomahawks, and other weapons and was spared if he reached the chief's house or a certain mark in safety. This custom was especially prevalent among the eastern tribes, though the Indians elsewhere spared captives who bravely survived the ordeal.¹⁷¹ The Aztecs, like the Romans, held gladiatorial combats in which the victors were given their freedom. The right of fighting for his liberty was granted, however, only to a prisoner who was a renowned captain or noble; it was an honor not accorded warriors of inferior rank. The prisoner, armed with a shield and short sword and tied by one foot, had to fight a fully equipped officer or soldier. Few could win against these odds, but if the captive did prevail, he was granted his freedom, all spoil taken from him in battle was restored, and he returned to his country covered with glory.¹⁷²

The mitigation of the cruelties of war received its greatest impetus, however, from the institution of slavery. "The moment when first the conqueror spared his victim in order permanently to exploit him in productive work, was of incomparable historical importance."¹⁷³ Slavery put an end to slaughter and alleviated torture and mutilation in order not to impair the efficiency of the captive as a worker.¹⁷⁴ How slavery improved the lot of the captive is clearly seen in transitional cases where death and slavery are alternatives. Among the Nootka, "all prisoners not suitable for slaves are butchered or beheaded."¹⁷⁵ Among the Tlingits, "prisoners of war were either killed or held as slaves."¹⁷⁶ While the Inland Columbians in general cruelly tortured their prisoners, "the Nez Percé system is a little less cruel, in order to save life for future slavery."¹⁷⁷ The Dahomans, who treated prisoners with the callousness above described, nevertheless made an exception in the

case of those destined for slavery.¹⁷⁸ Among the Ba-Yaka, "prisoners are sold as slaves, and, if wounded, are healed first."¹⁷⁹ In Benin, says an early writer, "before the slave trade commenced, the king and the rich immolated many slaves and all prisoners of war, but since they have found a profitable output for these in exchange for European goods, they now only sacrifice the maimed, the deformed, and those with whom they can do nothing."¹⁸⁰ The Maoris, of whom terrible tales of callousness are told, slew in cold blood all prisoners taken in war, with one notable exception—those reserved for slavery.¹⁸¹

With the development of agriculture organized slavery appears and prisoners of war are normally spared for this purpose.¹⁸² It was thus the advance to agriculture which laid the foundation for one of the greatest alleviations of the cruelties of war. Slavery placed an economic value on human life. It became more profitable to enslave prisoners than to eat, torture, or adopt them. Slavery, then, in its time and setting, "marked a decided improvement in human manners."¹⁸⁸ It was, in truth, a great humanitarian advance.

CHAPTER XV

THE STRESS TOWARD PEACE

PRIMITIVE society, as we have seen, consists of small groups struggling for existence side by side and often coming into competition and conflict. Within each group prevails the peace which is necessary for coöperation in carrying on the struggle for existence and for combining against a common enemy, while the intergroup relation, where it has not been modified, is one of hatred, hostility, and war. In general the more primitive and undeveloped the groups, the greater is the hostility and the fewer are the restraining influences. In such circumstances no man's life is safe outside his own group, members of the outgroup are robbed and slain, their wives are stolen, and when the different groups meet, suspicion fans the flames of enmity into open outbreak.

This hostile intergroup relation gradually becomes modified and restrained by the growth of several factors which tend to prevent conflict. These are institutions or regulative processes by which warfare is replaced by system. A very early one is *connubium*, an agreement by which groups take wives from one another. It brings about "a middle state of things between war and peace,"¹ and is a factor checking wife-stealing and consequent war. Treaties of *connubium* represent international law in the embryo and operate very effectively to bring about friendly intergroup relations.

Totemism, which normally involves exogamy or marriage outside the group, is an aid in binding groups together.² This effect is clearly seen in North America, particularly among the Haidas, where "every Indian looked for and found hospitality and protection in a house where he saw his own totem figured, and if he were taken captive in war his clansmen would ransom him."³

Tylor⁴ has shown in a very striking paragraph the political, social, and peaceful effects of exogamy. "On looking at the distinction between endogamy and exogamy . . . it will be seen that

there is a period in the growth of society when it is a political question of the first importance. While the vast forest or prairie still affords abundant food for a scanty population, small hordes may wander, or groups of households may be set up, each little tribe or settlement cut off from the rest, and marrying within its own border. But when tribes begin to adjoin and press on one another and quarrel, then the difference between marrying-in and marrying-out becomes patent. Endogamy is a policy of isolation, cutting off a horde or village, even from the parent stock whence it separated, if only a generation or two back. Among tribes of low culture there is but one means known of keeping up permanent alliance, and that means is intermarriage. Exogamy, enabling a growing tribe to keep itself compact by constant unions between its spreading clans, enables it to overmatch any number of small intramarrying groups, isolated and helpless. Again and again in the world's history, savage tribes must have had plainly before their minds the simple practical alternative between marrying-out and being killed out. Even far on in culture, the political value of intermarriage remains. 'Matrimonial alliances increase friendship more than aught else,' is a maxim of Mohammed. 'Then will we give our daughters unto you, and we will take your daughters to us, and we will dwell with you, and we will become one people,' is a well known passage of Israelite history." "Exogamy is an institution which resists the tendency of uncultured populations to disintegrate, cementing them into nations capable of living together in peace and holding together in war, until they reach the period of higher military and political organization."⁶ The peaceful effect of intermarriage on intergroup relations is to be seen here and there throughout the savage world.

Referring to exogamous tribes along the Amazon, Markham⁶ says, "These intermarrying tribes always live at peace with each other." Among the Asaba people of the Niger, "a man marrying into a neighbouring village derived a certain advantage in regard to intercourse with that village, as he could, in the troublous time existing twenty years ago, pass freely without danger of murder or robbery from his own to his wife's town."⁷ Throughout Nigeria, it may be recalled, when one side is tired of war, women of the other tribe married to men of the former tribe are sent to their relatives with offers of peace. They are

naturally taboo, since they have friends on both sides.⁸ A case to the contrary will be found in Southeast Africa, where intermarriages are frequent among the families of paramount chiefs but do not preclude war between the clans. This is owing to the curious custom that two chiefs of equal standing cannot meet. If by chance they should meet, one must salute the other, and salutation acknowledges the superiority in rank of the chief saluted. "If there is no salutation each chief's followers fall to blows, and a struggle leading to intertribal war is the result."⁹

Elsewhere, however, intermarriage operates to prevent war or to conclude a war already begun. In Timor, tribes related by the ties of marriage are peaceful and send men to assist one another in wars with other tribes.¹⁰ Intermarriage has been observed among Eastern Naga tribes at feud with one another. Luhupa women who are tattooed are granted safety in feud. "These women are much sought for by the southern men, because, however fierce may be their feuds, a tattooed woman always goes unscathed."¹¹ "Because of intermarriage, men in the Maori wars could safely visit the enemy. A person related to both parties was called a *taharua*, a "both sides."¹²

In Australia the peaceful restraint of *connubium* is more clearly marked. In all tribes of southeastern Australia, "there are certain men who are, so to say, free of one or more of the adjacent tribes. This arises out of tribal intermarriage." Indeed, marriages are sometimes arranged for what may be termed "state reasons." Marriages between the Dieri and adjacent tribes are frequently state affairs. Such a marriage is a subject of negotiation for several months. "Much diplomacy is used, as one tribe desires if possible to sift out the real reasons which induce the other tribe to desire the marriage." As a preliminary, handsome presents are sent to the girl's father, the chief and principal men. "If both sides desire to terminate disputes and settle grievances, the proposal may be agreed to in a few weeks." On the conclusion of such a marriage a place is fixed upon near the boundary between the two tribes, where a grand corroboree is held and all fighting tabooed. The effect is to be seen in Howitt's statement that "should any important matter arise between her husband's tribe and that of her parents, she becomes most useful in negotiating with the latter, with which she has naturally more influence than a stranger." She and other women are employed as messengers and ambassadors when there is a misunderstanding between the two tribes. Their persons are sacred and taboo, and they frequently succeed in maintaining friendly intertribal relations.¹³

Closely related to treaties of *connubium* are those of *commercium* or trade, which tend to bring about friendly intercourse by first modifying and later supplanting the hostile intergroup relation.¹⁴ Trade is an expedient in the struggle for existence, resting on group specialization and intergroup exchange. One tribe has natural deposits, as of salt or flint, which another lacks and desires, or it has special skill in the manufacture of some article for which the other group is willing to exchange products in whose manufacture it excels.¹⁵ Trade implies therefore a division of labor, coöperation, and intercourse. It is a peaceful adaptation and hence is antagonistic to war.¹⁶ In primitive cases, trade is often an alternative to war, and the manner in which it is conducted shows how it is a modification of the latter.

The incessant hostility of some primitive peoples renders extremely difficult all attempts at intercourse for purposes of trade. Robber tribes abound, traders are waylaid and plundered, and intercourse is precluded by hostile attacks. In such circumstances trading is a hazardous undertaking entailing many dangers. This state of affairs is clearly seen in the case of the Tedas and other African tribes among whom "exchange is made with weapons poised, the parties approaching and returning from each other's presence in crouching posture—ready to pounce or to flee—and in the most suspicious frame of mind."¹⁷ The hazards of trade in New Guinea are evident from the fact that "in the annual trading expeditions which the Motu make to Elema, the Motu women never accompany the men, the reason being that they would be stolen by the black Elema men, who like light-coloured wives."¹⁸ When the Dieri and other tribes of Australia send a party on an extended expedition to procure red ocher or other desired articles, the party is always made up of the picked fighting men of the tribe. "This was always regarded as being a perilous expedition accompanied by many dangers and privations. The party had to travel 300 miles and back, through the country of hostile tribes, keeping strict watch every night, and having to procure their food as they travelled, and on their return journey each man carried from 60 to 100 pounds weight of artificially made up red ochre." This annual expedition was one of the most important duties of

the tribe, and for it some great leader was always chosen. The red ocher was used as war paint, for charms, and for other purposes, and it was one of the principal articles exchanged with neighboring tribes for spears, shields, and other weapons.¹⁹ In Victoria, since no man's life was safe outside his tribe, all negotiations connected with barter were conducted by messengers whose persons, as has been seen, were sacred.²⁰ In South America a war party, sent out to procure salt, had to fight its way through hostile tribes and endure great privations and hardships.²¹

A further evidence of the modification of war toward trade is seen in "silent barter," in which the exchange of wares is effected without contact between the two parties. Herodotus tells how the Carthaginians used to trade with the natives of the northwest African coast under conditions where the parties did not dare to come within striking distance of one another. "The Carthaginians upon reaching the coast were accustomed to signalize their presence to the natives with columns of smoke. Meanwhile, their wares were disembarked upon the shore and they themselves returned to the ships. The natives, venturing down to the sea, examined the articles and placed beside them such of their own possessions as they were willing to give in exchange; then they also retired. The traders, returning, either accepted the native goods, in which case they removed them to the ships and departed, or rejected the amount as insufficient by returning to the ships and awaiting further offers by the natives. The natives might then add to their deposit until the quantity and quality desired by the traders was reached, and the latter accepted the terms as above indicated."²²

The Kubus of Sumatra trade with the Malays in much the same manner today. Forbes²³ has described the situation as follows: "In the small trade carried on between them and the Malay traders of the Palembang and Jambi Residencies, the transactions are performed without the one party seeing the other. The Malay trader, ascending to one of their places of rendezvous, beats a gong in a particular way to give notice of his arrival. On hearing the signal, the Kubus, bringing out what forest produce they may have collected, and depositing it on the ground at this place, hastily retire into close hiding, beating a gong as a signal that all is ready. The trader then slowly and cautiously approaches, lays down on the ground the cloth, knives, and other articles of barter

he has brought, to the amount which he considers an equivalent exchange, beats a gong, and in like manner disappears. The Kubus proceed then to examine the barter offered; if they consider the bargain satisfactory they remove the goods, beat their gong and go away; while the trader packs up the produce he finds left lying on the ground. If the bargain is not considered by them sufficiently advantageous, they set on one side a portion of their produce, to reduce it to what they consider the value of the barter offered; and thus the affair see-saws till finally adjusted or abandoned."

Despite the suspicion and warlike character evident in these cases, the tendency is plainly toward peace. One of the first effects of commerce is to substitute peaceful for warlike intercourse. For it is tolerably clear that, had the parties met without its influence, hostilities would have resulted.²⁴ Trade has been said to be antagonistic to war, and primitive tribes make efforts to adjust conditions so that commerce may be carried on. These adjustments are treaties of *commercium*, a state of things intermediate between war and peace. Hostilities are suspended for the time being in order that trading may go on. A noteworthy instance of this nature is the peaceful access which tribes possessing natural deposits allow to other tribes who come to procure these necessities. In West Australia, where the tribes from the interior come down every year to the coast, passage is allowed only for that purpose.²⁵ Some tribes in Australia are in possession of stone suitable for the manufacture of tomahawks, which they exchange for red ocher, gum, pitchuri, or pieces of grass tree for making fire by friction. In some cases expeditions for the purpose of barter travel several hundred miles.²⁶ A clan of the Bunurong tribe owned a stone quarry, which was taken care of by one Billi-billeri, the head of the family. "When neighbouring tribes wished for some stone they sent a messenger to Billi-billeri saying that they would send goods in exchange for it, for instance, such as skin-rugs. When people arrived after such a message they encamped close to the quarry, and on one occasion Berak heard Billi-billeri say to them, 'I am glad to see you and will give you what you want, and satisfy you, but you must behave quietly and not hurt me or each other.' If, however, people came and took stone without leave, it caused trouble and perhaps a fight between Billi-billeri's people and

them.”²⁷ The same custom of peaceful access prevailed in North America. “Peace was maintained by the Indians in the sacred territories of the red pipestone.”²⁸ Salt is another desirable commodity which has led to restriction of warfare. Salt deposits are frequently “holy ground” on which no fighting is allowed but where barter and trade take place. Lippert²⁹ has shown how salt and luxuries of similar nature have spurred men to activity such as they rarely display in regard to more important things, and have thus promoted intercourse and trade and consequently peace.

The character of trade was distinctly warlike among the early Phoenicians, Greeks, and Italians.³⁰ As Goethe³¹ said, “*Krieg, Handel, und Piraterie, Dreieinig sind sie, nicht zu trennen.*” War, trade, and piracy went together. This was particularly the case with the Phoenicians, who were pirates first of all. “All the Phoenicians cared for was commercial gain: if in force, they had always pillaged, robbed, and practised piracy; if inferior in strength, they fell back upon pilfering, cheating, and kidnapping. They were known to Homer as rogues and thieves, but were endured throughout antiquity for the sake of that which they brought within reach of active and progressive, if rude, races.”³² Among the Greeks themselves, booty wars were a regular practice on land, and were not dishonorable, while on the sea and coast piracy was common. “The sea-going stranger was either merchant or pirate, welcome in either case, if he came in peace.”³³

For the development of trade, peace is necessary. Hence less war means more trade, and *vice versa*. The Eskimos about Bering Strait illustrate this point. “In ancient times inter-tribal communication along the coast was irregular and uncertain, owing to the hostile attitude of the people toward one another. For this reason trading was then confined to those villages which happened to be on friendly terms. Now the old barriers have been broken down, and active barter between the different communities has become a marked feature of their life.”³⁴ Many primitive tribes are in the transitional stage, where peace prevails at the time of trading, but hostilities are resumed immediately afterward. Of the Australians, Curr³⁵ says: “Between tribes actually engaged in barter, peace, of course, prevails for the time; but it is no guarantee against sor-

cery, nor, as soon as business is concluded, against those murderous night attacks by which native warfare is carried on." Similarly the Bangala will spare from robbery and murder only those out-group members who have come to trade with them.³⁶

As trade becomes more important in the economy of the group, peace expands to cover such operations. We saw above that messengers conducting negotiations for barter are taboo and that hostilities are prohibited in the neighborhood of natural deposits. In addition, peace is sometimes extended to the market and to traders on the way to market, as was done during the Middle Ages.³⁷ When tribes discover that coöperation is better than strife, trade and peace come gradually to supersede war. Trade has done much to quell the Naga tribes of India, and wherever the *pax Britannica* has been put into effect among backward peoples trade has rapidly grown. "By about 1855 it was found that trade had so strong a hold among the eastern Nagas that the policy of closing the markets on occasion of a murder or outrage by hillmen was speedily followed by a surrender of the guilty parties."³⁸ In the Solomon Islands until recently war, murder, and incendiarism were the order of the day, but now peace prevails among the natives and intercourse is possible. This has been effected by the copra trade. When, for instance, the traders made it profitable to the Shortland islanders to furnish great quantities of copra, these people speedily made peace with their inveterate enemies on Bougainville, since the latter place was rich in coconut trees.³⁹

In this manner trade has operated to supersede war because it presents a better adaptation to life conditions. Increasing trade brings advancing civilization. It has brought groups into peaceful contact and made possible exchange of ideas as well as of wares. Traders carry their mores wherever they go and disseminate the knowledge they pick up on their journeys.⁴⁰ Thus it is possible to speak of the "culture mission"—unconscious to be sure—of the Phoenicians and others. They have had no thoughts beyond their own material gain, but in satisfying their own interests they have done much to spread the seeds of civilization among the peoples visited.⁴¹

In addition to the peaceful influence of intermarriage and

trade, several other savage practices tend to prevent armed conflict. One of these may be called elementary diplomacy. It is said that among the Kamilaroi of Australia disputes over hunting grounds and trespasses thereon are sometimes settled by parleys instead of by resort to arms.⁴² In Timor, when one tribe has made a raid on the fields or herds of a tribe in a neighboring kingdom, a messenger is sent with the intelligence to its rajah. If the rulers of the two kingdoms are united by the ordinary ties of friendship, the affair is settled, after long parleys and discussions, by the payment of an arranged price. If good will does not exist between the two, no satisfaction will be obtained, and war is prepared for. Even then efforts are made to avoid a conflict, and "when the armies meet, a last discussion of the question is held by a representative of the respective armies. If no agreement is come to, the fight begins."⁴³

Similarly the Battaks, before taking up arms, "negotiate for days together in fiery speeches, while neighbouring chiefs try to effect an accommodation."⁴⁴ The Bubis of Fernando Po refer disputes between villages to arbitration,⁴⁵ as do the Quissama in Angola,⁴⁶ while among the Chinooks of North America efforts were always made to settle their differences amicably before declaring war.⁴⁷

An institution with an even greater effect in preventing warfare and enforcing peace is the primitive secret society. The main business of these associations is to initiate young men into manhood, but they also have much political and social power, especially in the absence of a definite chieftainship or where the chief has but little authority. The membership includes practically every adult male of the tribe and sometimes the societies are intertribal in character. Through their secret rites and mystery the societies have a unique hold on the people. Webster⁴⁸ writes as follows of the appeal they make: "They arouse the universal sentiments of curiosity, fear, and awe; they surround themselves with that veil of mystery so attractive to primitive minds the world over, and they appeal with ever growing power to the social and convivial aspects of human nature, to feelings of prestige and exclusiveness, and to the consciousness of the very material privileges connected with membership. Under these circumstances it is

natural to find secret societies of the tribal type widespread among savage and barbarous peoples. By the side of the family and the tribe they provide another organization which possesses still greater power and cohesion. In their developed form they constitute the most interesting and characteristic of primitive social institutions."

The secret orders, especially those of West Africa, are concerned with every matter of public interest, civil as well as religious. "They punish crimes and act as public executioners, serve as night police, collect debts, protect private property, and, where they extend over a wide area, help to maintain intertribal amity."⁴⁹ They are effective engines of government. Miss Kingsley⁵⁰ characterizes them as follows: "The machine as a machine for the people is splendid; it can tackle a tyrannous chief, keep women in order, and even regulate pigs and chickens, as nothing else has been able to do in West Africa." "All of them are judicial," she says in another place,⁵¹ "and taken on the whole they do an immense amount of good. The methods are frequently a little quaint. Rushing about the streets disguised under masks and drapery, with an imitation tail swinging behind you, while you lash out at every one you meet with a whip or cutlass, is not a European way of keeping the peace, or perhaps I should say maintaining the dignity of the Law. But discipline must be maintained, and this is the West African way of doing it."

An editorial in a Sierra Leone newspaper remarks that the three secret societies in the Niger Delta, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro-land "have and exercise judicial functions exemplary and disciplinary in their effects. By their means law and order are observed to such an extent that many of the unrestrained and rowdy outbursts indulged in by so-called civilized communities and people are practically unknown."⁵² The Ogboni Society of the Yorubas "really holds the reins of government, and kings themselves are obliged to submit to its decrees. The members are popularly believed to possess a secret from which they derive their power, but their only secret appears to be that of a powerful and unscrupulous organization, each member of which is bound to assist

every other, while all are bound to carry out and if necessary enforce, the decrees of the body."⁵³

Possessing such power, the secret societies are a great factor in enforcing peace and order within the tribe, and they frequently secure amicable settlement of intertribal disputes. The Duk Duk society in Melanesia, for example, is described as "a power with sufficient influence to enjoin peace on contending parties."⁵⁴ Among the Negro tribes of the Bight of Benin and the Bantu tribes of Corisco Island and the Ogowe River "there was a power known variously as Egbo, Ukuku, and Yasi, which tribes, native chiefs, and headmen of villages invoked as a court of last appeal, for the passage of needed laws, or the adjudication of some quarrel which an ordinary family or village council was unable to settle."⁵⁵

Some of the societies have a secret language and a badge by which members may recognize one another. This often protects a native when journeying outside his tribal bounds. Holub⁵⁶ mentions encountering some Koranna natives with three cuts on the chest. They admitted, when questioned, that they belonged to a secret society. Each said, "I can go through all the valleys inhabited by Korannas and by Griquas, and wherever I go, when I open my coat and show these three cuts I am sure to be well received." After a *Nkimba* novice has acquired the secret language and become a full member, the members in the other districts "hail him as a brother, help him in his business, give him hospitality, and converse freely with him in the mystic language." Those who belong to the society in Old Calabar are "thereby enabled to travel through the country without danger."⁵⁷

The Ukuku secret society "could end tribal quarrels and proclaim and enforce peace where no individual chief or king would have been able to accomplish the same result."⁵⁸ Sometimes representatives of this fraternity from several tribes "meet together and discuss intertribal difficulties, thereby avoiding war."⁵⁹ Not long ago, in the island of Corisco, a long-standing feud between two tribes was settled in such a manner by the Kimbe Ukuku society.⁶⁰ "The *Purrah* of Sierra Leone was formerly a most effective instrument for preventing conflicts between the tribes; its deputa-

tions sent out to make peace were always respected."⁶¹ There are many other instances of the same nature. The secret societies, besides securing peace, sanction covenants and treaties by punishing transgressors severely, and in these various ways constitute an important factor in preventing war.

Despite the material advantage of plunder and slaves derived from warfare, wars are at least inconvenient and distressing, and there is a marked tendency to obtain better adaptation by peaceful means or to suspend hostilities on certain occasions. At initiation ceremonies, corroborees, and other gatherings, peace is necessary if the ceremony is to be performed or the meeting held. Hence fighting is frequently placed under a ban on such occasions. Other tribes may then safely be invited, and social intercourse once begun leads to more friendly relations. Indeed, in Australia special meetings are held to which all neighboring tribes can come and amicably settle any disagreement that may have arisen.⁶²

The Araucanians of South America find it necessary to suspend hostilities at times because war interferes with their self-maintenance. The basis of all their subsistence is the fruit of the pine, and every year during the autumn months tribes make excursions to the pine forest, where they remain until sufficient has been collected for the following year. "Each tribe has its own district, inherited by custom from generation to generation and inviolate, by unwritten law, from other tribes, even in time of warfare. This harvest was formerly of such supreme importance, that all inter-tribal quarrels and warfares were suspended by mutual accord during this period."⁶³ The Njamus of East Africa water their plantations by a ditch dug during the dry season. At the ceremony of opening the ditch all quarreling and fighting is tabooed.⁶⁴ Here religion joins with self-maintenance to prevent strife.

In New Britain warfare has been minimized in a different way through self-maintenance interests. In this island every life taken and every wound inflicted in war must be paid for in shell-money, else peace cannot be made. As the compensation demanded is high and is always exacted, prudential and economic considerations restrain in no small degree the desire for blood. Thus the frequency and fatality of war are greatly lessened.⁶⁵

In their efforts to prevent disputes and warfare the Bangala of Africa have devised a curious and roundabout procedure, using the means at hand to fit a new situation. Weeks⁶⁶ has described the cus-

tom as follows: "In a district there was generally a chief who was appointed by the towns of the district to act as judge in all important matters—at palavers between town and town, and family and family. At the time of his appointment the heads of all the families living in the district who wished to come under his jurisdiction cut down his plantains and banana trees. This action gave him a *casus belli* against all the towns that acknowledged him as judge. By the cutting down of his plantains he became the offended party, and as such had the right of aggressive action against the offenders. Now it was the custom that the offending town must not go to fight the offended town, but must await for the offended ones to attack them—the offenders. No subsequent quarrel could be taken up until the first was settled. Hence the above chief appointed as judge might enrage a town by his decision, and might call on the other towns to help him enforce his verdict, yet the said town could not attack the chief judge's town because of the old standing palaver of cutting down his plantains and bananas. This ensured the chief judge's immunity from quarrels with people who did not like his decisions, and as there was no fear of such quarrels there was a guarantee of a certain amount of justice and impartiality in the decisions given. He was paid to act as judge by those who needed his services, and this pay refunded his temporary loss from his destroyed plantains and bananas."

The Somals of Harar have hit upon a time limitation as a means of restraining fighting. Among them all quarrels must be fought out within three days, after which three more are allowed for negotiating peace.⁶⁷

The state of incessant hostility prevailing among so many primitive tribes is further checked in some instances by the power of religion. The graves of chiefs and ancestors, it has already been seen, are sacred and taboo, as are the sanctuaries and temples which grow up around them. Fighting is interdicted on such holy ground. Thus the Tongans, among others, "held it as sacrilege to fight within the precincts of the burial places of their chiefs; and the greatest enemies must perforce meet there as friends, under penalty of being visited with premature death."⁶⁸ From such conceptions have arisen the right of asylum and the peace of the temple. Here and there among savage tribes are to be found taboo or fetish houses in which protection and peace are secured for all who enter.⁶⁹ A similar place of refuge is the sacred storehouse in central Australia. "Everything in its immediate vicinity is sacred and

must on no account be hurt; a man who was being pursued by others would not be touched so long as he remained at this spot." During the ceremonies when the sacred objects are brought to the ceremonial grounds, where large numbers of men from different tribes assemble, no display of arms is permitted and quarrels for the time being must be forgotten.⁷⁰

Religion has placed an effective time taboo on fighting in Samoa. At the annual temple-building old grudges may be settled by conventionalized fighting, which terminates with the completion of the temple. This must suffice for the year. "A quarrel with neighbours at any other time, and rising to blows, was frowned upon by the god Fe'e, because it was not left till next year and temple-building time."⁷¹

War is sometimes prevented among savages by a common worship. Among the Fijians, a tribe allied to another by the bond of a common god, though they have nothing else in common, will not take up arms against the latter. "Members of that tribe may enter their village, slaughter their animals and ravage their plantations, and they will sit complacently by; for they are brothers and worship the same god."⁷² Common worship has also led to the custom of forbidding war during religious festivals and to that of granting safe-conduct to pilgrims.⁷³ Thus the Tahitians would not molest an enemy who came to make offerings to the national idol.⁷⁴ Among the Chibchas, "pilgrims to Iraca were protected by the religious character of the country even in time of war."⁷⁵ The Amphictyonic council guaranteed a safe and inviolate transit to the sacrifices and games, even through hostile Hellenic states. In ancient times peace was a religious duty of all Arabs during certain sacred months, and the Aenezes today never fight during three days in each lunar month.⁷⁶ During the Latin festival when sacrifices were made to Jupiter, a truce was observed throughout all Latium. The influence of the Church forced weekly suspensions of feudal fights.⁷⁷ In this way developed the "Truce of God," which is perhaps the most remarkable case in history of a law to establish a time taboo against war and violence.⁷⁸

Religion and other factors have also tended to remove the disastrous effects of one of the most persistent causes of war among

primitive people—blood revenge. The law of blood vengeance demanded satisfaction for every death, and a retaliatory act simply reversed the obligation, so that, unless an understanding were reached, the only outcome was mutual extinction. Existence would have become impossible, had blood vengeance been entirely unrestrained. This is seldom the case, however, and in some places it even operates automatically to prevent bloodshed. Thus among the Nagas, revenge is so certain and so disastrous in its effects, that the people are reluctant to enter into quarrels which entail such consequences.⁷⁹ Burckhardt⁸⁰ says that blood revenge for the same reason has contributed more than any other circumstance to prevent the warlike tribes of Arabia from exterminating one another. Among other tribes blood revenge ceases when an equal number have been killed on each side, while in general, by the principle of group responsibility, public opinion is brought to bear on each member of the tribe to keep the peace.⁸¹ Men are thus restrained from indiscriminate murder, for their act affects not only themselves but their whole group as well. Group responsibility is consequently an effective means of preserving law and order.

Especially in the in-group was the operation of blood revenge checked, for it meant disunion and internal strife. Murder was thus placed under a taboo, and religion sanctioned the interdiction. It became a deadly sin to kill a fellow tribesman, and a murderer incurred the displeasure of the gods. The wages of sin were death, but could at times be compensated by a sacrifice of atonement, by the performance of certain ritual acts. It was a lesser crime to murder an outsider, however, and a slayer was more afraid of the disembodied spirit of a fellow than of that of a neighboring tribesman.⁸²

Religion has also had a salutary effect by substituting the oath and the ordeal for actual vengeance. The accused person among many tribes submits to trial by ordeal—drinking poison being a very common form—or takes oath, calling on the gods to witness and to punish if false. His guilt or innocence is determined by the outcome. The chief virtue in the procedure is that the ordeal settles the matter once for all, ends all possible deadly feuds and

bloodshed, and saves many a man from an ever present fear of his enemies.⁸³

There are also means by which a blood feud can be ended and future feuds avoided. As an instance of the former, the Central Eskimos sometimes settled a feud by mutual consent, and as a sign of reconciliation both parties touched each other's breasts, saying, "*Ilaga*" (my friend).⁸⁴ The Ba-Yanzi cease hostilities when a slave is handed over to be eaten,⁸⁵ and the Bantu when a woman is paid and a goat divided as a covenant of peace.⁸⁶ The natives of Borneo terminate a feud by decapitating a chicken and rubbing the blood on the chest and arms of everyone present.⁸⁷

Since blood feuds render existence so difficult, tribes here and there make groping efforts to avoid them and to secure better adaptation. Among the Araucanians, "to avoid feuds and reprisals, the blame [for a death] was generally cast on a *huecuru* (evil spirit), who had taken the form of some living creature."⁸⁸ A murderer among the Southern Californians was safe if he gained refuge in the temple, in which case his punishment was left to the god. The Neeshenams adopted a time taboo. "Revenge must be had within twelve months after the murder or not at all."⁸⁹ The Akamba had a complex system whereby the death penalty was inflicted on a person recognized as a public danger without fixing the blame for his demise on any individual, thus avoiding a blood feud.⁹⁰ The North Kachar Nagas, proceeding by the only method they knew for settling grudges and quarrels, avoided inexorable blood feuds by convening the whole village at some convenient place at stated times, when a general *mêlée* occurred, but no weapons might be used. "Severe bruises and scratches resulted, yet these never gave ground for a quarrel, whereas at other times the lifting of a hand would lead to a blood feud."⁹¹

In a way somewhat similar the Australians resort to the ordeal by weapons as a means of adjudicating a charge of murder and of preventing intertribal war.⁹² In Tangier the laws of blood feud can be laid aside; hence many Riffis have moved to that quarter.⁹³ The Montenegrins put an effective check on blood feuds by widening the peace-group. Artificial relationships were created by marriage and treated as actual. There could be no feud between blood-relatives. Similar rela-

tionships were established by having members of one clan or tribe stand godfather to children in another. This method not only reconciled a blood feud but also made the parties allies instead of enemies.⁹⁴

Along these lines there developed one of the chief methods of preventing feuds and at the same time of widening the peace-group so as to include former enemies, namely, blood-brotherhood. Originally organization rested on the idea of blood unity, and as Tylor⁹⁵ says, "it would be impossible to put more clearly the great principle of old-world morals, that a man owes friendship not to mankind at large but only to his own kin, so that to entitle a stranger to kindness and good faith he must become a kinsman by blood." The group united by ties of blood was limited in size by nature. It could be extended artificially, however, by substituting a fictitious bond for real blood unity. This is done quite literally among some savages by blood-mixing. The blood of each party is rubbed into wounds in the other, or the two drink one another's blood. Later, blood is mixed with food or wine, and ultimately it becomes merely symbolic. Herein is seen a combination of religious and social motives. An artificial bond is created by a blood sacrifice and the blood bond becomes also a cult bond. The sanctity of the bond is assured by the gods, who will punish the transgressor. The duties of bond brothers are peace and protection, and thus enemies are made friends, the peace-group is widened to include others, and bloodshed is prevented.⁹⁶

In Africa the power of blood-brotherhood as a bond of peace is very clearly marked. Among the Bangala, "blood-brotherhood was very common and was performed with much ceremony. The effect of this rite was to stop all feuds and cause the contracting parties to act in all respects as blood relations." It kept peace within the tribe and also between tribes, for when the chiefs of two tribes entered the bond all their people were brought in under the agreement. The covenant received the strong sanction of religion, and much of their folklore depicts the evils of breaking blood-brotherhood taboos.⁹⁷

Among the Ba-Mbala it frequently happens that the chiefs in a neighborhood enter into a pact against bloodshed. If a murder is committed in one village, each of the other villages has a right to demand compensation for the death. The total amount exacted is sufficient to ruin the murderer, and the village or its chief must settle the account.

With this penalty, and the certainty of its infliction, murder is infrequent. The bond is respected as holy, and any breach of it is regarded as a *casus belli*.⁹⁸

Among the Baganda, when two people of different clans or tribes wish to make an indissoluble bond with one another, they swallow a coffee bean smeared with each other's blood.⁹⁹ The Bahima conclude blood-brotherhood by mixing blood with milk,¹⁰⁰ the Wa-Sania and Wa-Giriama by eating a piece of meat covered with one another's blood,¹⁰¹ the Gala, Afar, and others by drinking the blood, etc.¹⁰² In some cases blood-brotherhood descends to the children.¹⁰³ In all cases in Africa it cements friendship and enjoins peace. It likewise assists the traveler. Livingstone,¹⁰⁴ who accidentally became a blood-relative of a native woman when some of her blood squirted into his eye while he was excising a tumor from her arm, relates that she remarked, "You were a friend before, now you are a blood-relation; and when you pass this way, always send me word, that I may cook food for you." He mentions several cases where natives established such pacts in different villages, to be sure of friendly treatment and aid. Stanley was blood-brother to an African king, many other Europeans have undergone such ceremonies, and Mohammedan traders frequently enter blood bonds in order not to be regarded as foreigners and treated as enemies.¹⁰⁵

The Papuans use the blood bond to strengthen a treaty;¹⁰⁶ the Kenyahs of Borneo terminate a blood feud in this way.¹⁰⁷ The sanctity of the blood bond often prevents war in Timor,¹⁰⁸ the Chin Hills,¹⁰⁹ and among the tribes of Assam,¹¹⁰ while in Australia blood-drinking is associated with special meetings of reconciliation by which intertribal differences are resolved.¹¹¹

Among the Arabs two groups often made themselves blood-brothers by commingling their blood, at the same time smearing it on the god or fetish so as to make him a party to the covenant.¹¹² The Hebrews had a similar ritual.¹¹³ Blood-brotherhood prevailed among all the Indo-European races.¹¹⁴ The early Greeks sealed truces in this way, wine being substituted for blood.¹¹⁵ The Scythians, Lydians, and Armenians drank blood or mixed it with wine, as did the knights of the Middle Ages. The Vikings and Germans formed such friendships. The latter mixed the blood with beer, later they merely dipped their fingers in the beer, and finally they retained only the expression, *Brüderschaft trinken*.¹¹⁸

Another equally powerful factor in mitigating and preventing

blood feuds arose when a property compensation came to be substituted for actual vengeance. The offender could stay the hand of the relatives of a murdered man by paying them "blood-money." This practice has received the name *weregild* or *wergeld* from the Anglo-Saxon for "man-money." With it is found the custom of paying for lesser hurts—so much for the loss of a leg, an eye, etc., as in the Roman *lex talionis*.¹¹⁷ Among savages, whatever passes for currency is thus used as composition. The conception of family or group responsibility is still maintained, and all are bound to assist any group-comrade in making payment. The matter, once settled, can never be reopened, and thus a feud is healed or prevented, bloodshed avoided, and peace secured.

As the power of the chief increases, the right of private vengeance or of composition is taken out of the hands of the individual and lodged in those of the chief. Murder then is punished by the group through its political head, and the culprit is fined, banished, or put to death. A transitional case is to be seen where the government apprehends the murderer but gives him over to the injured family to do with as they like.¹¹⁸ With political development, offenses come to be regarded as public rather than private wrongs and are dealt with more and more by the government. The individual thus gradually loses all right of private justice: the state replaces him as avenger. In this way arose the king's peace, which suppressed private war and became the law of the land.¹¹⁹ The pleas of the crown were originally those actions where the crown claimed exclusive jurisdiction on the grounds that the king's peace was affected; they later came to include all criminal actions or proceedings. The old state of affairs lasted for a long time, however—in England until the fifteenth century and until today in parts of Arabia, the Balkans, and elsewhere among advanced as well as savage peoples.¹²⁰ In the highly civilized parts of the world today the state has replaced the individual, while our criminal law has grown out of private vengeance.¹²¹ The last form of private war to exist was the duel, and when it disappeared the state may be said to have taken over completely the punishment of crime.

Another primitive usage tending to promote friendly intertribal

relations and to prevent outbursts of hostility is the custom of guest-friendship. By this expedient friendship, hospitality, and safe-conduct supersede the old practice of robbing and slaying aliens, rights enjoyed by members of the in-group are extended to outsiders, and the bounds of the peace-group are thus widened. It represents an attempt to secure better adaptation in intergroup relations. No tribe can long remain in absolute isolation; its members are constantly crossing the boundaries of other tribes for the purpose of visiting, trading, etc. Thus it is mutually advantageous to extend hospitality to strangers. Like other institutions, guest-friendship rests on force, and if its rights are denied to a stranger the offense is sufficient to plunge the two groups into war.

Among the Eskimos, hospitality is regarded as a sacred duty because upon it depends the very existence of every community. Their unfavorable environment makes mutual reliance and confidence indispensable. So binding a duty is hospitality that cases are known where murderers have presented themselves at the house of their victims' nearest relatives and have been received and entertained for a long time.¹²²

There are but few cases of guest-friendship as a developed institution among the most primitive peoples. One of these is found among the Araucanian Indians. "An inhospitable person is generally condemned by public opinion, as sordid and mean. The guest is considered sacred to those under the same roof, and of the same clan; and it is the duty of all to protect him and his belongings while he is within their jurisdiction. Any infraction of this rule is severely punished."¹²³ Among the Bangala, "in dealing with an alien it would not be considered wrong to rob, beat, abuse, or even murder him, unless he had come on a visit, for trade or other purposes, to some one in the town. He would then be under the protection of his host, and would receive his hospitality and hence the hospitality of the town and neighbourhood. The host would have a *casus belli* against anyone who molested his guest."¹²⁴

Similar conditions prevail elsewhere among savages,¹²⁵ but it is among more advanced peoples that guest-friendship is a developed institution and regularly practiced. Among the Homeric Greeks guest-friendship was an institution of great social and political importance. Every liberty and privilege was granted to the stran-

ger within the gates, and cordial ties, enduring for generations, were often established. "The once established relation afforded to each of the parties and to his children a special sponsor in a strange land, a land where otherwise he could claim no acquaintance; the obligations descended upon the houses of the respective parties, in the death or absence of the original guest-friends. Such an ancestral relation was particularly holy and strong, and treasured in the traditions of the family. Mutual visits preserved the bond, and consequent diffusion of knowledge, tending toward amalgamation of ethnic elements, was among the results." Ancestral guest-friends would not contend in battle; each was bound to rescue the dead body of the other for burial or to ransom him when captured in war. It was a serious crime to infringe the guest-right, and one of the causes of the Trojan War was Paris's violation of the bond of guest-friendship, while it was under this same system that the Trojan Expedition gathered forces from almost all the districts of Greece. "The whole force of public opinion supported the expedition in a manner which indicates a collective aim to avenge an attack upon a collective possession." Among the advantages of this custom are its great services to the traveler, its promotion of communication, and the consequent diffusion of culture and mutual knowledge. It breaks down the barrier of tribal narrowness and widens the peace-group. The stranger is no longer an enemy; he has become a friend.¹²⁶

It has always been a principle in Arabia that the guest is inviolable.¹²⁷ The origin of the custom undoubtedly lies in the conditions of existence, for in the lack of a stable government and in a desert where tribes must constantly move about, life would be almost impossible were there no restraint on intergroup hostility. Guest-friendship is the peace of the desert, and practically the only peace which the Bedouin tribes enjoy. "To be a Bedouin," says Burckhardt,¹²⁸ "is to be hospitable; his condition is so intimately connected with hospitality that no circumstances, however urgent or embarrassing, can ever palliate his neglect of that social virtue." The guest is regarded as sacred, his person is protected, and a violation of hospitality by the betraying of a guest has not occurred among these people within the memory of man. "To tell

an Arab that he neglects his guest, or does not treat him well, is one of the greatest insults." Through the operation of this custom, travelers receive safe-conduct, they are protected and given food, and communication is enhanced. Without it no man's life would be safe outside his own group. It is therefore an effectual restraining influence in intertribal relations. How important it is may be inferred from the fact that "the immense distance of space between Mekka and Damascus is often traversed by a poor single Syrian, who trusts altogether to Bedouin hospitality for the means of subsistence during his journey. Among such poor people as Bedouins generally are, no stronger proof of hospitality can be given than to state, that, with very few exceptions, a hungry Bedouin will always divide his scanty meal with a still more hungry stranger, although he may not himself have the means of procuring a supply; nor will he ever let the stranger know how much he has sacrificed to his necessities."

Among the Berbers there is no stable government, and petty warfare is incessant. Under such circumstances a traveler or stranger would be at the mercy of enemies everywhere were it not for the custom of *zitat* or protection. The stranger is supplied by some member of the tribe with a handkerchief or turban which he wears in a prominent position, or he is accompanied by the tribal member himself, and with this escort he is assured safe-conduct. He may pass with absolute security through that tribe. Any mishap that might befall him would be avenged by the owner of the emblem he carried.¹²⁹ The stranger, in other words, is taken into the tribe for the time being and enjoys the peace and right to life and property which are characteristic of the in-group. In this way the limits of the peace-group are extended to include outsiders. Sometimes whole groups enter into guest-friendship bonds, as happened in later Greek history, at Rome, in Egypt, in Assyria, and elsewhere.¹³⁰

Further expansion of the peace-group may come about through groups entering into a peaceful alliance. The Iroquois League was perhaps the most remarkable case among primitive peoples of an extensive peace-group or peace federation. There are other instances in ethnography of alliances being effected for the purpose

of joint action in war,¹³¹ but the League of the Iroquois is unique in that it was organized and directed toward the maintenance of peace. The formation of the League is attributed to Hiawatha, whom Hale¹³² thinks was an actual person, an Onondaga chief who inspired his people to carry through his purpose, the establishment of universal peace. The League was to expand by voluntary accession if possible, otherwise by forcible means. At one time it promised to dominate the whole continent, but following contact with Europeans it began to decline.¹³³ Theretofore, however, it had been an effective force in furthering peace. It had put a stop to blood revenge by substituting law and civil authority, abolished internecine wars, mitigated warfare in general, and extended the area over which peace prevailed.¹³⁴ "It was, for its stage, fully as marvelous a production of statesmanship as are these United States—themselves a great peace-confederation."¹³⁵

By these various expedients peace is extended to ever wider circles until ultimately it embraces the state, the peace-group *par excellence*.¹³⁶ The old condition of affairs represented by innumerable petty tribes living in constant enmity is superseded by one in which the groups have become united in larger aggregates with common interests and ties. The process, conditioned in large part by political development, is essentially one of widening the bounds of the in-group, which is a peace-group. Thus as the in-group expands the scope of war is restricted. The same end is effected by the establishment of peace federations between larger groups or nations. The conclusion to be drawn is that war will diminish as bonds of larger and larger peace-groups are forged by the nations of the world.

CHAPTER XVI

WAR AS A FACTOR IN SOCIETAL EVOLUTION

AMONG the social effects of war, one of the most far-reaching has been that on population. In addition to its obvious direct results, such as the decimation of peoples, war has exerted a strong indirect influence on population policy. Under nomadic conditions, where war is incessant, only the strongest can withstand the severe competition of life. Strong men and able fighters are needed to maintain the mature strength of the tribe. Weaklings are not wanted; indeed, they cannot be supported. To these hard facts of life the folkways of infanticide and killing the old are direct and primitive adjustments.¹ Only the strong can be reared, and when they have passed their usefulness they are killed.

As in Sparta where only the strongest children were reared, so among the Araucanians, "owing to the continual warfare and the desire to bring up robust and warlike descendants, all misformed or delicate children were slain at birth."² Among the natives of the Papuan Gulf, "whatever serves the highest interests of the tribe is justifiable; if a woman bears twins, it is right to bury one of the twins, because no mother is thought to be capable of nourishing at the same time two children as successfully as she can one. Two weak men are not to the credit of the tribe that one strong man can be; hence, until quite recently, infanticide was taught and practised as being essential to the future interests of the tribe."³

In Australia, "when old people become infirm, and unable to accompany the tribe in its wanderings, it is lawful and customary to kill them. The reasons for this are—that they are a burden to the tribe, and, should any sudden attack be made by an enemy, they are the most liable to be captured, when they would probably be tortured and put to a lingering death."⁴ Many Brazilian tribes have been forced in self-defense to the same practice. The old are killed because they are a burden and because they can no longer aid in war.⁵

This selective type of population policy ceases to be an adjustment when a settled life replaces nomadism and peace supplants

war. Industrial societies do not lay such stress on physical fitness, since other qualities are more in demand and the unfit can find a place in the social order.⁶

But quality of population is not the only desideratum. Mere numbers may be important, and this is especially true in militaristic societies. Where war results in the destruction of a large part of the population, infanticide, for example, is out of place. Tribes which practice it succumb in the competition with others, and the custom is thus automatically selected out of existence. It becomes desirable, rather, to increase the population. Some tribes resort to adoption to recoup their losses; others increase their numbers by more obvious means, like the Maori custom of "causing men to grow."⁷ Children are a valuable asset; boys are needed as warriors and girls as breeders. A large population becomes the objective of the group's prosperity policy, and polygyny is one of the means of obtaining it.⁸ It is said that the losses of the Peloponnesian War compelled the Athenians to admit to citizenship the *nothoi* or children of Athenian men by non-Athenian mothers. There is some evidence that they even allowed men to take two wives each.⁹ In the mores of all militaristic peoples, therefore, a large population is regarded as desirable *per se*. The larger the population, the greater the number of warriors and the more secure the group in the competition of life.

Since its losses bear heaviest on the men, war tends to create a disproportion between the sexes, and this may have an effect on the forms of marriage.¹⁰ "With few exceptions polygamy is usually the result of wars, depleting the male population, or prosperity, through which men are enabled to buy wives."¹¹ We need only recall here the relation of war and wife-capture. The practice of stealing women leads to the introduction of new mores and hence to cultural growth. Roth,¹² for instance, says that "it is far from unlikely for the spread of agriculture to be due to the system of wife-capture."

War has been one of the most persistent causes of migrations.¹³ The influence of migration and conquest on political development and state formation has already been sufficiently dwelt upon. Migrations have also had an important effect upon racial type.

Movements of peoples inevitably result in race mixture. Whether this result is advantageous or not, is a much controverted question. "The unfortunate cross breed has come in for condemnation from all quarters. The favorite description is that the mongrel inherits the vices of both parents and the virtues of neither."¹⁴ Petrie¹⁵ cautions us that this common verdict "is only due to the unhappy fact that the parents of such mixtures are usually those who have far more vices than virtues to transmit," while Tozzer¹⁶ shows clearly that it is an example of the "failure to recognize the difference between the biological and social inheritance." But whatever the eugenic consequences of race mixture may be, it has certainly produced a fusion and modification of physical characteristics, with the result that today "there are no pure races, no races whose blood is free from admixture with that which flows in other races. In the endless vicissitude of human migrations and conquests all the streams of human life, parted from some unknown and doubtless single source, have met and mingled and parted again."¹⁷

War, through migration and conquest, has contributed not only to race mixture but also to cultural exchange. This latter influence of war has been of far greater significance in the evolution of society. Wherever races have amalgamated, or even merely come into contact, we find a mutual borrowing of folkways. Cultural diffusion is as constant and basic a process as growth from within.¹⁸ "There is but one way," says Wissler,¹⁹ "to prevent cultures from mixing, viz., to keep them from touching. Conquest cannot do it unless it amounts to instant extermination. That this should be so is not strange, for the very accumulative nature of culture and its apparent tenacity of life require a readiness to inoculation, diffusion, or perhaps a better term is, susceptibility to suggestion." War brings peoples into contact, even though it be hostile contact. If it leads to conquest, acculturation is speeded up. Where a minority imposes itself on a majority, it usually adopts the language and religion of the latter—through force of numbers and because a strong government can be maintained only through the unity of these two important factors.²⁰ In other cases, especially when the conquerors possess a higher civilization,

they impose certain of their mores on the vanquished, often as conditions of peace, but more frequently by demonstrating the superiority of their own culture.

When the people of Vumba Kuu, East Africa, in 1630 conquered the eight surrounding towns, they imposed certain customs as terms of peace which are observed to the present day.²¹ Strabo²² says that the Bactrians had a custom of giving their fathers, when they had outlived their faculties, to the dogs, and that Alexander the Great, when he conquered them, prohibited the practice. The grandest treaty of peace recorded in history, thinks Montesquieu, was that which Gelo, an ancient king of Syracuse, concluded with the Carthaginians, for when he had defeated them he required as a condition of peace that they should cease to sacrifice their children to the gods.²³ The Peruvians, before beginning a war with their less civilized neighbors, would call upon them not only to adopt the religion of the sun but also to put an end to their cannibalism, human sacrifices, and other savage customs. But it was not so much by force as by the contagion of example that they sought to spread their civilization.²⁴

A striking instance of the basic changes wrought by war and conquest on the mores of a people, and one for which our information is unusually full and significant, is that of the Araucanians of Chile. Before the Incas invaded their country, the Araucanians led a purely nomadic life as hunters, shifting their *toldos* or skin tents from time to time as the exigencies of the chase demanded. They were extremely warlike and culturally undeveloped. They possessed but very rudimentary arts and had no knowledge of metals. The Peruvian invasion changed all this and brought the Araucanians for the first time into touch with civilization. The Incas introduced the llama and vicuna into the country, and from that time weaving became a recognized art among the northern tribes, although farther south the possession of a few of these animals was considered a sign of great wealth. The Incas brought with them the knowledge of the use of metals, and thenceforth both gold and silver were extensively worked for ornamental purposes. The *mitimaes*, colonists imported into the conquered country from Peru, gradually mixed with the Indians of northern and

central Chile, introducing among them the first elements of agricultural and pastoral life. The tribes to the south did not adopt the new mode of life—or did so only to a very limited extent—owing to the abundance of natural products and the state of continual intertribal warfare. The northern Araucanians learned the art of irrigation; in the south the frequent rains rendered this unnecessary. As a result of this cultural diffusion the entire mode of life of the Araucanians was gradually changed. They became more sedentary and less warlike. They constructed rude huts instead of the usual *toldo*. “As Humboldt has so justly remarked, ‘the most difficult and the most important event in the history of human society is perhaps the change from a nomadic to an agricultural life.’ This change among the Araucanos was not brought about by any compulsory conditions, but seems to have been adopted gradually by the race on seeing the advantages accruing from the new mode of life, and at first only in a very desultory way.”

A later foreign invasion, this time by the Spaniards, likewise made an indelible impression on the culture of the Araucanians. Though the Spaniards never succeeded in completely subjugating these people, their superior civilization had its effects. The Spanish conquest brought with it a fuller use of metals, new cereals and plants, and new domestic animals. Agriculture received a great impetus through the introduction of the plow, which replaced the digging stick, and domestic animals, which aided in cultivation. Sheep were also introduced, and the wearing of woollen clothing became general. In the fertile plains of southern Chile the sheep increased rapidly and soon formed one of the principal sources of wealth among the Indians. The Spanish invasion furthermore resulted in a considerable change in tribal government through the necessity of presenting a united front to the invader. Spirituous liquors were also taken over from the Spaniards, and they effected serious social changes. “It became a lucrative business, and many large fortunes were made by distilling cheap ‘fire-water’ in the frontier districts. To such a degree did this traffic attain that it is a common saying in the south that the distillers did in a few years what the Spaniards failed to accomplish in three centuries—reduced the tameless Araucano. This vice has taken

such a hold of the Indian that in general it has completely changed his character and mode of life, and from being a fierce, untiring, vengeful patriot, he has become a drunken, cringing, soulless vagabond, who would sell land, stock, wife, daughters, or his soul itself to indulge in his craving for drink."²⁵

The culture of the ancient civilized peoples, like the Egyptians and Assyrians, was likewise spread as a result of war. Although they frequently exterminated the whole adult male population of their enemies and absorbed the women and children into their own people, they did not always do so. It was a usual policy of the Babylonians, Assyrians, and Chaldeans, as well as of the Medes and Persians, to transplant whole colonies of a conquered nation, settling them in the territory of another subject people. Sometimes these colonies were superior in civilization to the people amongst whom they were settled, and in such cases they became new centers of cultural diffusion.²⁶

But war has not always promoted cultural advance; it has often retarded it. Since "civilization is a function of numbers and of the contact of numbers,"²⁷ cultural progress is difficult where warfare checks population growth and prevents social intercourse by stimulating hostility, suspicion, and ethnocentrism. War hinders trade, and "trade has always been the greatest natural carrier of civilization."²⁸ The state of incessant hostility among savage tribes interferes with the peaceful occupations on which civilization rests. Agriculture, for instance, can be carried on, in the absence of slaves, only by the women, for the men must be constantly armed and on guard. "Who can expect men to turn to profitable work when their absence is seized on as an opportunity of raiding their village, and they return to find their houses a heap of ruins, their relatives fled or slain, and their wives and children taken captive to be sold as slaves?"²⁹ Through fear of being seized and eaten, robbed, or slain the moment they leave the protection of their own group, primitive peoples naturally keep to themselves. This enforced isolation, like the Chinese Wall, has prevented the acquisition of foreign ideas and influences and has resulted in cultural stagnation. The effect is observable even among more advanced peoples. As a result of innumerable wars with

China and Japan, the Koreans purposely isolated themselves. "They adopted the only possible remedy which lay to their hands, but this protracted isolation has told heavily on them. From being a race of energetic warlike people, they have become a nation of loafers."³⁰

To return again to its benefits, war breeds a hardy, vigorous, energetic race. It acts as a stimulant; it keeps the people, especially the men, keyed up to action; it arouses a spirit of energy and enterprise. "We were a strong and healthy people then," said a Maori chief, referring to the time before the Europeans came and instituted a reign of peace.³¹ "We are no longer men since we do not fight,"³² said the New Caledonians under similar circumstances. Where war has been stopped, native men frequently have nothing to do. Deprived of one of the greatest stimuli to exertion, they become slothful and often degenerate. It is significant that primitive women have invariably found it easier to adopt the ways of civilization than have primitive men; there is less disruption of their habitual tasks; they can continue their household and agricultural duties, while the men can no longer hunt and fight. The stimulating influence of war has been strikingly expressed by Thomson³³ in the case of the Fijians. "The trivial loss of life is more than counterbalanced by the activity, alertness and tribal patriotism which are fostered in an atmosphere of personal danger. Every man having a selfish interest in the increase of his own tribe, public opinion compelled the observance of those customary laws that guarded the lives of women and young children. The lazy could not then idle away their day in philandering with the women; the adventurous could not evade their share of the communal labor by paying long visits to distant islands, even if they did not find enough to sate their taste for adventure at home. The *insouciance* that has followed the decay of custom was impossible, because the tribe that gave way to it was lost. The teaching of all history is that man deteriorates as soon as he ceases to struggle either against hostile man or unkind nature. A barren soil, an over-crowded community, or a fauna dangerous to man will serve the need, but in a country where there is food without tillage, land enough for twenty times the population, and no man-eating tiger

or poisonous snake, there must be war to keep the people from sinking into paralyzing lethargy."

War also teaches discipline, a quality of immense social advantage. Primitive peoples are otherwise quite deficient in this respect. A certain degree of discipline is necessitated by coöperation in the struggle for existence, as when a group submits to the leadership of its ablest man in hunting. Religion likewise exerts a large measure of discipline. But when a tribe is on the warpath, discipline and subordination become of supreme importance. Military success depends largely on discipline, and that group which possesses more of this quality will, other things being equal, triumph and survive. It is no accident that dominant tribes like the Zulus and Dahomans have been characterized by their high degree of organization and subordination to authority. Discipline learned in war is of the greatest service in peace.³⁴ It can be utilized in peaceful undertakings of social importance, which without it would be impossible.

While military discipline educates men, military interests quicken their ingenuity and inventiveness. Weapons and the like invented or improved under the stress of war have been applied with advantage to the uses of peace. The Paleolithic stone blade served, not only as a weapon, but also as a tool.³⁵ Spencer³⁶ finds that few savages display capacity for industry and perseverance except in the making of weapons, on which they often bestow much time and pains. They ornament them more than their other artifacts.³⁷ The implements developed in war are often used by savages for other purposes.

Among the Papuans and the Pelew Islanders, the lance and war-club serve effectively as paddles. Throughout the Caroline Archipelago the shoulder-ax is a tool as well as a weapon.³⁸ The Australian boomerang serves not only in war but also in the chase, and, when two are clicked together, as a musical instrument.³⁹ The Maori war-club is also used as a digging stick and a chief's staff.⁴⁰ In New Guinea, tomahawks and knives, besides making efficient weapons, are employed in clearing the scrub for gardens.⁴¹ The Garos and Burmese use their spears as knives or bill-hooks in cutting away the boughs and creepers that impede the jungle path.⁴² The chief weapon of the Nagas and other frontier tribes of India, the *dao*, a heavy short sword, is also used as a carpenter's

tool for wood cutting and as an important agricultural implement.⁴³ In Borneo, too, many of the swords, though intended primarily for warfare, serve also as agricultural implements and as carpentering tools. Thus one variety is used by the Malays and Milanows for clearing the jungle or splitting the logs of the sago palm. Another, called the *latok*, is widely employed for agricultural purposes, and becomes, when grasped in both hands by the handle and the shoulder of the blade, a highly effective chopping tool.⁴⁴

Throughout history, military inventions have led the way and have afterward been applied to industry. "The invention of gunpowder came at the end of a series of efforts and experiments which had been continued for centuries for the purpose of attaining some more effective means of carrying on war, the chief business of the time." It was a grand invention in military art, but without such explosives little real progress could have been made in mining, canal building, and railroad construction. "Chemical inventions were made in the attempt to produce combinations which would be destructive in war; we owe some of our most useful substances to discoveries which were made in this effort. The skill of artisans has been developed in making weapons, and then that skill has been available for industry. The only big machines which the ancients ever made were battering-rams, catapults, and other engines of war. The construction of these things familiarized men with mechanical devices which were capable of universal application. . . . Again, we are indebted to the chemical experiments in search of military agents for our friction matches."⁴⁵

Many remarkable scientific discoveries and improvements, made in the course of the recent World War, have found striking application to the uses of peace. This is, perhaps, especially true in the fields of aviation, public health, and chemistry. The War brought about the first extensive use of the airplane and tremendously hastened its development. It thus became a great stimulus to commercial aviation. Like the Spanish-American War, which has to its credit the conquest of yellow fever and the practical elimination of smallpox from Cuba and the Philippines, the World War contributed to public health advance, notably in the case of typhoid and venereal disease control. Whereas in the Civil War and the Spanish-American War the losses from typhoid exceeded the num-

ber of those killed in action, in the World War the American expeditionary forces had almost no losses from this source. The War forced the nation to face the problem of syphilis and gonorrhea. An effective program of preventive measures was put into operation, and its "reflex effect upon the civilian campaign against venereal disease," says Winslow,⁴⁶ "was so great that I am convinced America has gained in this one direction more lives than it lost through the destruction wrought by German shot and shell." In the field of chemistry, poison gases invented to slay are now being usefully applied in medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is estimated that two hundred important civilian uses have already been found for the lethal vapors. Some are used as germicides, others for the extermination of animal and insect pests. Police departments are adopting tear gas for the dispersing of mobs and the apprehension of barricaded criminals. Phosgene has been found to be a powerful bleaching agent for earth and sand and has become indispensable to glass manufacturers. Modifications of the army gas mask have been adapted to fire fighting and industrial work.⁴⁷ In these various ways have the arts of war contributed to the arts of peace.

War has had an even greater effect on social organization than on the development of the arts. Slavery, for instance, is largely the child of war. While a fellow tribesman may become a slave through nonpayment of a debt, in punishment for crime, or in other ways,⁴⁸ the most important source of slavery is war. The vast majority of primitive slaves are aliens captured in war. Slavery, as we have seen, began with the war captive, when he or she was spared. It arose from the desire to get something for nothing, from the love of dominion which belongs to vanity, and from hatred of labor.⁴⁹ From slavery, and from conquest, another result of war, sprang differentiation of classes and occupations. "The great function of slavery," writes Nieboer,⁵⁰ "can be no other than a division of labor." Through conquest, society became divided into a ruling militant class and a subject industrial class. The regulative function devolved upon the soldiers, the operative upon the serfs or slaves.⁵¹ Out of the servile classes have evolved nearly all vocations save those of war and government.⁵² Upon division of

labor rests cultural advance. It is significant that "slavery and its modified forms of serfdom and peonage were the prevalent forms of labor down to the age of commerce."⁵³ On this more advanced stage slavery became a maladaptation and disappeared, but in its time and place it was an expedient adjustment and the basis for an advanced economic and social organization.

War has had no less pronounced effects on political, industrial, and even ecclesiastical organization. The necessity of combining for offense and defense developed the social capacity for community of life and action generally. It gave strength and coherence to the internal organization of society and led to the consolidation of simple aggregates into compound aggregates with a consequent expansion of the peace-group.⁵⁴ The form of government varies with and is largely dependent upon the military character of a people. The regimentation of industry and the hierarchical organization of the Church, like the regulative organization itself, reveal a military prototype. In short, it is upon a military model that the social order has been organized, "with its political and ecclesiastical hierarchies, its powers within powers, its ranks under ranks, its concentration of authority."⁵⁵ Business and politics, religion and ethics, all reflect the influence of war in their vocabulary and symbolism. Expressions like "captains of industry" and the "army of labor" are based on more than a simple analogy. The vocabulary of politics is replete with fighting words like "campaign," "battle," "chiefs," "slogans," "banners," and "tactics," and sayings like "To the victors belong the spoils." Terms like "The Lord of Hosts" and "The Church Militant" and hymns like "Onward Christian Soldiers" and "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God" indicate the militarization of religion. "The symbols of virtue are still, for the most part, echoes of the battlefield. The sword, the shield, the gauntlet, armor, etc., are objects around which have evolved trait-complexes indispensable to our culture."⁵⁶

Perhaps the greatest influence of war has been its effect in producing societal selection. Evolution, in society as in the organic world, can come about only through the supplanting of inferior adaptations by superior ones, in short, through selection. In the social field these adjustments are mental rather than physical;

they are embodied in the folkways and mores, i.e., the culture, of human groups. Selection requires conflict or struggle between variations. In society this contest takes place, not between the mores themselves, but between their adherents or exponents, "and it is through the issue of that struggle that a given set of mores is carried forward toward universality or consigned to oblivion."⁵⁷ Group-conflict has always existed. It is nourished by the struggle for existence itself and fanned perennially by competition, group-egoism, political rivalries, and religious differences. The exponents of divergent codes of mores join battle on many fields—industrial, political, social, and military.

"War, resulting in the annihilation of one group by another, is the primordial agency of selection in the mores, and probably the most efficient that has ever existed."⁵⁸ The destruction of a group involves the disappearance of its mores. "Doubtless most of the earliest and most determinative selections in the course of societal evolution came about in this manner. They are the ones that have lasted and have laid down the lines for the subsequent development of society."⁵⁹ But war presently issues in subjection and enslavement rather than annihilation, and here the selection is less severe and less complete. Neither code prevails in its entirety; rather there is a mutual exchange of mores resulting in a composite product.

"During a time of peace, rest, and routine," says Sumner,⁶⁰ "powers are developed which are in reality societal variations, among which a certain societal selection should take place." If this cannot be accomplished by peaceful means, war is resorted to. Through it new powers emerge and create a new social order. "The Germans tell of the ruthless and cruel acts of Napoleon in Germany, and all that they say is true; but he did greater services to Germany than any other man who can be mentioned. He tore down the relics of medievalism and set the powers of the nation to some extent free from the fetters of tradition; we do not see what else could have done it. It took another war in 1870 to root out the traditional institutions and make way for the new ones. Of course the whole national life responded to this selection. The Roman state was a selfish and pitiless subjugation of all the rest of man-

kind. It was built on slavery, it cost inconceivable blood and tears, and it was a grand system of extortion and plunder, but it gave security and peace under which the productive powers of the provinces expanded and grew. The Roman state gave discipline and organization and it devised institutions; the modern world has inherited social elements from it which are invaluable. One of the silliest enthusiasms which ever got control of the minds of a great body of men was the Crusades, but the Crusades initiated a breaking up of the stagnation of the Dark Ages and an emancipation of the social forces of Europe. They exerted a selective effect to destroy what was barbaric and deadening and to foster what had new hope in it by furnishing a stimulus to thought and knowledge." In short, war has "destroyed what was effete and opened the way for what was viable."

"What appalls us, however, is the frightful waste of this process of evolution by war—waste of life and waste of capital. It is this waste which has made the evolution of civilization so slow."⁶¹ War is a rude method of selection which has been largely supplanted in civilized societies by other means.⁶² "War and revolution never produce what is wanted, but only some mixture of the old evils with new ones."⁶³ According to Giddings,⁶⁴ there is no historical justification for the notion that war can perfect the internal adaptations of national life, the finer adjustments of sectional, racial, or class interests. He cites as a concrete illustration the failure of the American Civil War to solve the problem of race interests. "Can any sane man expect that the problem will ever be solved in any other way than through the infinitely slow process of a social evolution so complex as to baffle analysis?" Here we encounter the gist of the evolutionist's case against war. "It can hasten social integration, but in the measure that it succeeds, it prevents or postpones those finer and endlessly varied adaptations which require freedom and time, and upon which completeness of life depends."

The course of evolution reveals a growing tendency to settle disputes without recourse to arms. In the past, however, war has often been the only possible resort, the only adjustment available to meet the situation. It thus offers a good parallel to slavery, an

institution which, though rightly opposed by the civilized peoples of today, served in its time as an excellent adjustment. Furthermore, war has not yet been entirely superseded by other expedients; when peaceful measures fail, the only recourse is the inevitable appeal to the sword.

In our study of the evolution of war in early societies, we have surveyed the greater portion of the whole history of the institution, for civilization is as yet in its infancy as compared with the vast expanse of primitive times. In the light of the perspective which we have acquired, what may be predicted about the future? The underlying causes and motives of war were present at the beginning and for the most part still exist. Men are still vain and susceptible to the appeal of glory. Ethnocentrism and chauvinism still persist, and race differences seem insurmountable. Religion has not ceased to be a factor in war, though civilized men do not fight for the same religious reasons as savages. Population pressure still prevails, and the struggle for existence, leading to economic competition and political rivalry, is omnipresent. These factors must be altered before war can become less frequent. Increasing trade and intercourse between nations should reduce variations in language and customs and, through knowledge, supplant mutual distrust and prejudice by mutual confidence and tolerance. An even more fundamental change must come about with respect to population. An advance in the arts of life and an improvement in the standard of living, with wide dissemination of the means of birth control, should, by operating on the relation of population to land, favorably alter toward peace the basic reason for group-conflict, viz., the competition of life. "That human beings may in time shrink from killing one another, for a point of national pride or of religious difference, is at least conceivable; but it is not conceivable that human beings will ever hesitate to kill one another when, as a result of the pressure of population, they find that war is the only alternative to starvation."⁸⁵

While the sources of group-conflict are ever present and seem, indeed, to be rooted in the very conditions of life, the question is open whether conflicting interests are not to be adjusted by other means than the appeal to arms. It must be admitted that war has

had certain beneficial effects and that, among primitive peoples at least, it has not on the whole been countér selective.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, it must be remembered that war is not an end in itself, as its apologists assert, but is merely a means to an end.⁶⁷ Our study seems to indicate that war is a less fit adaptation than other means that have in part superseded it. As compared with peaceful trade, for instance, war has undoubtedly been wasteful and uneconomic and has militated against the development of civilization. The steady expansion of the peace-group since the dawn of history gives evidence of the superiority of industrialism over militarism.⁶⁸ There can be no question but that coöperation furnishes a better adjustment to man's condition on earth than a system of hostility and cross-purposes. The tendency throughout the ages has definitely been toward the development of peaceful methods of settling disputes, especially within the group. Bagehot believes that "in government by discussion we have an agency attained through immeasurable effort and suffering for the inhibition of hasty action, for the subordination of brutal passion to a reasonable expediency, for the final settlement of disputes by reason instead of by force."⁶⁹ The question whether war will ever cease depends, in the last analysis, on whether the means developed for adjudicating internal differences can be extended to the intergroup relation, with the result that peace shall prevail and war become an anachronism.

APPENDIX A

ETHNOCENTRISM AND TRIBAL NAMES

THE northern Samoyeds style themselves either Hasovo or Nainek. Both words mean "men."¹ The Tunguses also call themselves "men."² The inhabitants of northern Japan call themselves Ainu, that is, "men" or "people," but the non-related Japanese mockingly refer to them as *aino*, "dogs."³

In Australia a tribal name is usually the native word for "man." "In such cases there is a prefix or postfix meaning 'people' or 'tribe;' thus the Wotjo are collectively called Wotjo-baluk, that is to say, 'tribe of men.' . . . The word 'Kulin' (man) was used by tribes over most of the eastern half of Victoria, with the exception of Gippsland."⁴ The aborigines of Gippsland give to themselves the name of Kurnai, signifying "man." The word Kurna has the same meaning and is similarly applied by the Dieri of Cooper's Creek. The Narimyeri of South Australia call themselves "men," and designate all other tribes as "Mer-kam"—wild or savage.⁵ Where a distinction is drawn between tribesmen and aliens, the term applied to the latter is usually one of contempt or of fear. Thus the Kurnai speak of themselves as "men," and give the name of Brajerak, from *bra*, "man," and *jerak*, "rage" or "anger," to certain of their neighbors. They call the people who live in the Western Port district of Victoria, Thurung or "tiger-snakes," because "they came sneaking about to kill us."⁶

The name adopted by the aboriginal tribes of Perak means "countrymen." All through this district, as among the Malays in general, the native names signify "men."⁷ The designation of the Marava tribe in southern India means "warrior."⁸ Although the Todas are in general unwarlike and inoffensive, Rivers⁹ says of them: "The characteristic note in the demeanour of the people is given by their absolute belief in their own superiority over the surrounding races." The Tongans and other Polynesians call themselves "men."¹⁰

Similar cases are found in Africa. The word Bantu means "men."¹¹ Livingstone¹² says that the name Bachuana (Bechuana) is derived from *Chuana*—alike or equal—with the personal pronoun *Ba* (they) prefixed, and therefore means "fellows or equals." "When addressed with any degree of scorn they reply 'we are Bachuana, or equals—we

are not inferior to any of our nation.' " The different Hottentot tribes are known by appellations ending in *Kua*, "man," and the Bechuanas simply add the prefix *Ma*, denoting a nation. The Hottentots call themselves "men of men."¹⁸ In British East Africa, the people on the south side of Kavirondo Gulf call those on the north side *Kavirondo*, which is "more or less an epithet of reproach."¹⁴

According to their traditions, the Baganda have had an unbroken line of kings for twenty-two generations; they trace their descent from Kiutu, the supreme being.¹⁵ This case represents another phase of ethnocentrism found among many tribes. The origin of a tribe is commonly given as that of the human race. Its ancestors were the "first men;" other peoples are not accounted for.¹⁶ Many North American Indians, the Caribs, Greenlanders, Hawaiian Islanders, Scythians, and others regarded their ancestors as the first men.¹⁷

The term Inuit, applied by the Eskimos to themselves, means "men" or "people."¹⁸ The word Eskimo itself is derived from an Algonquian term meaning "eaters of raw flesh."¹⁹ The Greenland Eskimos think that Europeans have been sent to Greenland to learn virtue and good manners from them. "Their highest form of praise for a European is that he is, or soon will be, as good as a Greenlander."²⁰ The names of the tribes in central Alaska mean "man" or "men."²¹

The northern members of the Siouan family call themselves Dakota, which means allied or federated. The English word Sioux is a corruption of the term applied to this people by the Algonquians; it means "snakes," and thus "enemies." The Uchis call themselves "children of the sun," which they regard as their mother. Grinnell,²² our authority for the cases just cited, has said with reference to the Attacapan stock: "These people were called by their neighbors cannibals, the name of the tribe meaning, in Chocta, man-eater." The names Tinneh, Kenai, and Kuchin all denote "people." Kiowa signifies "real or principal people."²³ The word Illinois comes from *ilini*, meaning "men," while Delaware or Leni Lenapi denotes "original or principal men."²⁴ Perhaps the most striking case of ethnocentrism among the aborigines of North America is that of the Seri Indians, who "outpass most, if not all, other tribes in dignifying themselves and derogating contemporary aliens. . . . The obverse of the same sentiment appears in the hereditary hate and horror of aliens attested by their history, by their persistent blood-thirst, and by the rigorous marriage regulations adapted to the maintenance of tribal purity; for just as their highest virtue is the shedding of alien blood, so is their blackest crime the transmission of their own blood into alien channels."²⁵ The Caribs of South America, when asked

whence they came, answered, "We alone are people."²⁶ Their name for themselves means "brave men."²⁷ Tupi means "comrade." The Tupis call all other people *Tapuyas*—a contemptuous word for "foreigners."²⁸

APPENDIX B

INITIATION CEREMONIES

ORDEALS, of which circumcision is a general feature, are common to all initiation ceremonies.¹ The main purpose of these ordeals is to prepare the boys for the life of warriors; they serve as tests of courage and endurance. Many tribes of the Amazon valley have a custom of testing the fortitude of the youths by scourging them; among the Marianas in particular the older boys lash themselves with a small girdle, "which operation is considered as proving their manhood."² The young men among the Woolwa Indians of Mosquito Territory have many physical ordeals to undergo before they are entitled to the privileges of man's estate. The community's opinion of the youths depends on the manner in which they endure the tests. "At intervals they have to sustain heavy blows on the back, given with the elbow of a strong man. The rest of the ordeals are of a similar character, all being apparently dealt with intention of ascertaining what amount of physical suffering can be sustained and endured."³ At the initiation of a brave in North Mexico, the chief took an eagle's talon and with it proceeded to score the young man's body on the shoulders, arms, breast, and thighs, until the blood ran freely. "The candidate was expected to suffer without showing the slightest signs of pain. The chief then handed to him a bow and a quiver of arrows; each of the braves also presented him with two arrows. In the campaign that followed, the novitiate must take the hardest duty, be ever at the post of danger, and endure without a murmur or complaint the severest privations, until a new candidate appeared to take his place."⁴

The young warriors on the northwest coast of America "bathed in the sea in winter time, after which they whipped each other with branches, and until the first encounter took place they fasted and abstained from water as much as possible."⁵ In a similar manner the Indians of British Columbia were trained in feats of strength and endurance and inured from infancy to hardship and privations. The Stseelis of this region made their children, as soon as they could walk alone, go out and bathe in the river every night and morning the whole year round. "They would first whip their naked bodies with small branches to make the skin tingle and burn. Some people used to put these whips in the flames of the house-fire for a little while. A whip thus treated when applied to a boy's back would save him from becoming idle and lazy. Whipped daily with such an instrument he would become an active and energetic man, and be able

to acquire much wealth. When they reached puberty they would constantly make use of the 'Kaitiostel' or sweat house, lance their bodies and limbs with knives, 'to let the bad blood out and make them strong,' and force long rods down their gullets into their stomachs to make themselves vomit. Often they would lie out all night and expose their bodies to the elements till they became so hardy that they could scarcely feel the cold at all, and could stay for hours without discomfort in the chilling waters of the river or lake."⁶

In Africa the same general practices are in vogue. Among the Bechuana and Kaffir tribes the boys, during their initiation, are clubbed on the back until blood flows. "This is intended," wrote Livingstone,⁷ "to harden the young soldiers, and prepare them for the rank of men." In the initiation ceremonies of the Bechuana, the most prominent feature after circumcision is the application of the switch. As is usual, the neophyte "makes it a mark of manhood to lie still without crying or wincing; but if there should be any obstreperousness, the switch is freely and unhesitatingly applied."⁸ Miss Kingsley⁹ says the West African "boys are exercised so as to become inured to hardship." Among the Naivasha Masai, "at the time of circumcision, should the youth show any sign of pain by wincing or making outcry, the onlookers, who are only males, beat his relations, and he is ostracised by his companions until the general circumcision ceremony is completed, after which he must kill a large bullock and invite the other boys to a feast. No youth is permitted to carry any arms save a bow and arrows until he has been circumcised."¹⁰

In the island Boigu, Torres Straits, the initiates are made to lie face downward at full length on the ground, a short distance from a fire, with their heads resting upon their arms. "The old men put leaves of the coco-palm on the fire, and when they were alight whipped the backs of the lads with them. If one of the latter got up and ran away, he was 'no good,' and they laughed at him. The skin of the lads was much burnt, and when the castigation was finished fresh water was poured over them." The initiation ceremonies as carried out at Tud, Nagir and many other islands were tests of bravery as well as lessons in endurance.¹¹

During the initiation ceremonies of the Kamilaroi tribe in Australia, the courage of the novices was tested at night. The old men would go into the adjacent bush, where they would "make hideous noises, and raise a terrific din, sounding the wooden instrument called *murrawan* (bull-roarer), and during this time the novices were not allowed to exhibit any sign of fear."¹² Among the Dieri and other kindred tribes of Central Australia, the next ceremony after circumcision is one called Wilyaru. The boy is directed to close his eyes. "One of the old men then binds the arm of another old man pretty tightly with string, and with a sharp piece of flint lances the vein about an inch from the elbow, causing an instant stream of blood, which is allowed to play over the young man until he is covered with it, and the old man is exhausted. Another then takes his place, and so on until the young man becomes quite stiff from the quantity of blood adhering to him. The reason given for this practice is that it infuses courage into the young man, and also shows him that the sight of blood is nothing, so that should he receive a wound in warfare he may account it as a matter of no moment. The next stage in the ceremony is that the young man is told to lie down on his face, when one or two young men cut from three to twelve gashes on the nape of his neck with a sharp piece of flint. These, when healed into raised scars, denote that the person bearing them has

passed through the Wilyaru. Should you ask a Dieri whether he is a Wilyaru he will point with pride to the scars on his neck."¹³ At the initiation of a Macquarrie boy, the men stand over him with waddies, threatening instant death if he complains while a tooth is being knocked out—the characteristic form of ordeal here. "He is afterwards cicatrized; if he shows any signs of pain, three long yells announce the fact to the camp; he is then considered unworthy to be admitted to the rank of men, and is handed over to the women as a coward. Thenceforward he becomes the playmate and companion of children."¹⁴

It has already been noted, when considering specialization in labor by sex, that women, because of their weakness and timidity, are despised; men believe themselves under certain circumstances in danger of contracting these undesirable characteristics. From this belief arise the many taboos surrounding the relation of the sexes and the various rites before men go on the warpath. The same idea is in evidence in the training of the boys. The Gallas of Northeast Africa amputate the mammae of boys soon after birth, believing that no warrior who possesses them can possibly be brave, and that breasts should belong only to women.¹⁵ Among the Bechuana, the neophytes cannot see any woman.¹⁶ The Narrinyeri boys of South Australia, during the progress of initiation, are forbidden to eat any food which belongs to women. In the Encounter Bay tribe, boys are told from infancy that if they see menstrual blood their strength will fail prematurely. Among the Dieri and other tribes the lads are forbidden to see women immediately before and sometimes after the initiatory rites or to eat in the sight of one.¹⁷ When the young Dakota is initiated into his warlike duties, the weapons given him are tabooed to adult females.¹⁸

Corresponding to the belief in the possibility of catching timidity from women is that of acquiring strength and courage from men. In the same Dieri and other kindred tribes, "it is thought that the presence of a distinguished man, such as a warrior, a head of a totem, etc., at the operation [of circumcision] tends to give strength to the young man while undergoing it."¹⁹ Among the tribes of Southeast Australia, "great fighting-men were placed, when dead, on a stage about six feet high, until the flesh decayed, and the young men would stand underneath and rub themselves with any juice which fell from it, in order to get the strength and fighting power of the dead man."²⁰ Such ideas and rites properly belong to the discussion of primitive religion and war, for the underlying idea is that of acquiring the spirit—or as some writers would say, the *mana*, that is, the virtue or influence—of the great warrior, which instils courage or other particular quality in the recipient. The same notion is to be seen in the island of Tud, Torres Straits, where the young men would "drink the sweat of renowned warriors,

and eat the scrapings from their finger nails which had become coated and sodden with human blood. This was mixed with their food in order 'to make strong and like stone; no afraid,' as the chief of Tud told Haddon.²¹ The belief evidenced here is that a part of anything has the properties of the whole; the soul of a person is contained in any portion of him.²² A warrior of the island of Nagir, in order to infuse courage into boys, would take certain parts of the body of a dead man (probably a slain enemy), and after specially preparing them, would administer the compound. After this dose, "heart along boy no fright," as the natives say.²³ This is a survival of cannibalism, as also is the case in British New Guinea, where the muscle behind the ear of a slain enemy is given in sago to the lads to eat so that they may be strong.²⁴ In order to be considered eligible as a warrior, the native of the Papuan Gulf must, during the initiation ceremonies, pass certain tests, the most important of which are to chew the root of the ginger plant and to drink the urine of the war chief. Holmes²⁵ says "the significance of observing these tests has not yet been ascertained," but in the light of the aforementioned facts and those to follow, it is very likely that they belong under the same religious beliefs and practices.

Since war is a matter of supreme importance in savage life, it permeates every phase of the group's interests and mores, and the aid of religion, among other things, is called in during the training of the warrior. Not only does religion play a large part in the initiation ceremonies of the boys, but its effect is also to be seen in other respects, as when, among the Bororo Indians, Frič saw the chieftain's youngest child, who was about a year old, making short jumps, while led by his blind grandmother. Upon asking the reason, he received the answer: "*para ser guapo*" ("to become brave").²⁶ Every male Dakota sixteen years of age or over is a soldier and is formally and mysteriously enlisted into the service of the war prophet. From him he receives the implements of war, which are consecrated.²⁷ Another excellent example of the relation of religion to war is the Omaha ceremony of cutting the hair, by which "the boy was consecrated to the thunder god, who thenceforth became the arbiter of life and death to the man." The hair which was cut off was laid away in a sacred case, in care of the thunder priest. "The hair was believed to have a vital connection with the life of the body, so that any one becoming possessed of a portion of it, might work his will upon the man from whom it came. . . . The hair might be said, in the light of the customs of the people, to typify life; in this rite the life of the child is placed in the hands of the god, through the severance of the lock of hair and its transmission to thun-

der; thus illustrating the Indian's belief in such a continuity of life, as that a part must represent the whole." The sign of the youth's consecration to thunder was the scalp lock, which was kept carefully braided, no matter how frowzy and tangled the rest of his hair might be allowed to grow. The significance of this ceremony is to be seen, according to Miss Fletcher,²⁸ in one of the ritual songs, which declares that "the life of a man, who must become a part of the cordon of safety to his people, and ever be ready to meet the enemy at home or abroad, is in the keeping of the gods, and only when they decree can he fall. Armed with this assurance he goes forth strong to meet danger, and if need be, death." Thus do the competition of life and religion react upon one another.

A new and often a secret name is given to candidates—signifying that they are now warriors.²⁹ Thus among the Turkana of East Africa, "each generation, as it attains the warrior's age, is given a distinctive name."³⁰ The Karamojo boy's name is altered when he has been on the warpath.³¹ The candidates, on entering the native circumcision lodges or schools in the Zoutpansberg district, usually receive some name which they adopt, much in the same way as the Zulu after enrolment is frequently known by the name of his regiment. This name acts as a countersign in time of war and disturbance.³² Every Bechuana tribe is likewise divided into regiments, each regiment consisting of those who are initiated together, and the men are known by their regiment name.³³ The practice of renaming boys at initiation time is common in Australia and has wide social significance.³⁴

Another important purpose of the initiation ceremonies is the inculcation of the mores. This is one of the processes by which the individual is adjusted to the culture of the tribe.³⁵ The ceremonies are in fact the schooling of the boys—practically the only formal education they get. This is directed toward making them fit members of the community, according to the mores which have been tested and selected and which are therefore taught them as the chief facts in their lives. Henceforth they are expected to do the work of men. Necessitated by the competition of life, man's work is chiefly that of the warrior, and the supreme importance of this work is echoed in the teaching of the boys.

For these reasons the initiates among the Bawenda of Africa are taught to be "brave in war, cunning in stealing, and true to their . . . ancestors."³⁶ One of the initiatory rites of the Bageshu is an address to the boys by the headman of the village. He tells them about their marriage customs, their history and beliefs; he also tells them who are the friends of each clan and who are its enemies, and impresses upon them

the necessity of being brave in fighting the battles of the tribe.³⁷ The teaching of morals—of what in their mores constitutes right and wrong—is one of the chief features of the initiation ceremonies of the tribes in British Central Africa. “A man must be brave in warfare; without fear rush into the middle of the battle. He must be just in hearing cases brought before him to settle. He must keep his wife in subjection (a man who is unable to beat his wife is looked down upon as a coward, as is also a man who would beat a child).”³⁸ At the close of the ceremonies in East Central Africa, “the young men have arms put into their hands and are harangued by the elders, bards, and magicians. They are now men and men’s work is to be theirs. Herding, hoeing, reaping, and all domestic duties in which they assisted their mothers, they have no longer any concern with. War, hunting, and hearing causes must now occupy their thoughts, for they are to take the place of the fathers, and on them will depend the defence of the tribe and the maintaining of its honour. They must defend their chief, avenge his wrongs, wage war at his word, and obey his commands if that should imply death; ‘a man can die but once,’ with which philosophy they are launched into the new life of full manhood.”³⁹

Among the Bechuana and Kaffir tribes the duties of man’s estate are inculcated in the boys at initiation time by means of a club. The men ask them, “Will you guard the chief well? Will you herd the cattle well?” Then they club the boys until blood flows.⁴⁰ War and herding are evidently man’s chief occupation here. Among South African tribes in general, weapons are placed in the boys’ hands at the close of the initiation ceremonies as a sign of full manhood. With these they are to defend their chief, wage war at his command, and generally use them as he directs, even if it be against their own mothers.⁴¹

The importance of this change in the life of the boy is clearly seen, together with the play of vanity, among the natives of Hood Point, New Guinea. Guise,⁴² who lived among these people for fifteen years, says it is very amusing to observe the sense of importance that the donning of the *toga virilis* (in this case a perineal band called *ivi*) confers on the boy. “The day before you will see him playing about under the houses with his friends, throwing miniature spears at cocoanut fronds, and otherwise exercising himself in boyish games, and regarding all girls with contempt. Once the *ivi* is fastened on, however, his whole demeanour changes. He stalks round with such an important and haughty air, looking neither to the right nor left, that it is most ludicrous. He joins in no more boyish games; but may be seen gravely talking with the elders of the tribes on the prospects of the crops, the ex-

pected advent of dugong and other deep-water fish; or the chances of war with neighbouring villages."

The boys among the natives of the Papuan Gulf receive at their initiation much advice respecting their duty to their tribe, which must always be given first consideration. "The enemies of the tribe must be the enemy of the individual initiate; it will be to the best interests of the tribe that it should be so."⁴³ The Kafir boy, in India, is given a dagger, the Kafir national weapon, and after his forehead and shins are smeared with blood he is acknowledged to be a man.⁴⁴ The intention of the initiation ceremonies of the natives of Southeast Australia is "to make the youths worthy members of the community, according to their lights." They are taught the mores of the group and their business in life.⁴⁵ After a man has been to one initiation ceremony in the Euahlayi tribe he may have war weapons and is dubbed a warrior; after he has been to five, he may join or be one of the war chiefs who hold councils of war and are the accepted authorities in regard to war and hunting.⁴⁶

The New World furnishes similar instances. When the native of North Mexico was admitted as a warrior, the chief instructed him in the several duties required of him, and then the novice was put to tasks fitting him for his life work—war.⁴⁷ Among the Jivaros of South America, the boy is initiated into the art and mysteries of smoking—the characteristic ceremony here—at which time the mores of the tribe are expressed. "All the family is gathered together; and the eldest member then makes an oration in which he especially dwells upon the valour and glorious example to be witnessed in the lives of the child's ancestors and actual grown-up relations, the number of enemies they have slain, and so forth. The hope is then expressed that the representative of the new generation in the family may follow these meritorious footsteps, and after the manner of his forefathers prove himself a brave warrior. The address delivered, the pipe is then handed to the poor little fellow; and after he has taken a few whiffs, all the elders puff seriously themselves in turn, and then wind up the proceedings by disporting themselves in chicha drinking, in celebration of the momentous event."⁴⁸

APPENDIX C

INSTANCES OF MILD WARFARE

AMONG the Eskimos, even when whole tribes are at variance, tribe does not fight against tribe, but a few selected champions decide the issue. "To sacrifice more would be folly."¹ When two groups of Eskimos, strangers to one another, meet, a fight generally ensues, but it is likewise left to champions.² Duels, with varying details, are also common when a member of any tribe meets a stranger, and they sometimes result in the death of one. According to the natives, the meaning of the duel is that the two men who have just met wish to know which of them is the better.³ This case represents a mild instance of the universal hostility felt by primitive peoples toward all strangers.

After a day-long fight between two strong bands among the Columbians, it often resulted that only one man was killed.⁴ The Chinooks, if unable to settle their differences amicably, would commence the battle, or if the hour was late, postpone fighting until the next morning. "As their armor was arrow-proof and as they rarely came near enough for hand-to-hand conflict [they fought generally on the water], the battles were of short duration and accompanied by little bloodshed; the fall of a few warriors decided the victory." The same was true of the inland Columbians, in whose battles "the number slain is rarely large; the fall of a few men, or the loss of a chief decides the victory. When a man falls, a rush is made for his scalp, which is defended by his party, and a fierce hand-to-hand conflict ensues, generally terminating the battle." Among the Central Californians, battles, though frequent, were not attended with much loss of life. "Each side was anxious for the fight to be over, and the first blood would often terminate the contest." Their method of warfare was not conducive to great slaughter, for it is said that among some tribes "children are sent by mutual arrangement into the enemy's ranks during the heat of the battle to pick up the fallen arrows and carry them back to their owners to be used again."⁵ In some conflicts the Pima Indians killed several hundred warriors, but these were rare occasions. Their raids usually ended with the loss of a man or two and the destruction of an Apache camp, with perhaps half a dozen of the enemy killed and a child taken prisoner.⁶ The Nicaraguans "fought desperately until their leader fell, but then they always ran away." Wars were frequent among the Mayas of Central America,

but they were also, as a rule, of short duration, and partook more of the character of raids than of regular wars. One campaign generally decided the tribal or national dispute, and the victors were content with the victory and the captives taken. In Yucatan, wars were usually of short duration because of the inadequate means of transportation, all the supplies being carried on the backs of women; consequently the loss of life was not great.⁷

Wars in Africa are by no means always bloody. In the northeast, for instance, the loss is relatively slight, for, if a few warriors are killed or wounded, the rest take to their heels.⁸ The Bahima have no organization in battle. "The men stand together in an unruly mass, now and again one man rushes out from the main body to shoot an arrow or throw a spear, and having done this he hastily retires into the main body again. When a rush is made it is done by the whole body; should the rush be successful the battle may be decided in one attack; should the foe resist, the attacking party must fall back and resort to other tactics. In such battles the loss of life is never great, ten or twelve casualties being considered a heavy loss."⁹ The tactics of the Bageshu are very similar. "Every now and again some one breaks out singly and rushes upon the foe. Sometimes two men may rush out to be met by a couple of the opposing army; it thus becomes a series of hand-to-hand fights, whilst the bulk of the army stands and looks on. When one or two have been killed and several wounded the battle ends."¹⁰ The Kikamba manner of fighting was never very desperate. "The Theraka say that they were women in war, but very dangerous in thick bush; but among themselves warfare seems to have consisted largely of much rushing about and shouting until one side or the other was terrified and ran away. Natives have told me," writes Dundas¹¹ of them, "that certain people had medicine which they smeared between their thumb and forefinger, the merit of which was that it made it impossible for them to err in their aim, and that such people were often not allowed to go to war because of the destruction that they did. This somewhat comic view of warfare shows that the object of fighting was not so much the destruction of the enemy, but when, despite this, it is certain that numbers were killed, this is only to be explained by the fact that the fighting went on continuously."

Although the natives of New Guinea are warlike, their conflicts do not always end disastrously. In the Dutch Protectorate the wounding or killing of one or two combatants on either side gives victory to the other.¹² At Hood Point the hostile tribes arrange themselves in two lines facing one another with an interval of about one hundred yards be-

tween them. "A man slips out from one line and abuses the other side. He is soon confronted by an opponent equally versed in the science of vituperation and the amount of bad language used would satisfy an Australian bullock-driver. They gradually become more excited until finally they dash at one another and a spear or two is thrown; other warriors now rush out from either side and the battle commences. It is, however, of but short duration, as a man or two wounded on one side is considered sufficient excuse for that side to run away."¹³

In Malaysia, "the armies generally have champions, who, fantastically attired, challenge the hostile champions to single combat."¹⁴ Warfare in the Solomon Islands consists in treachery and surprise; the natives never stand in open fight. "If they are not able to kill their enemy with one blow, they do not stop to give him another, but take to their heels."¹⁵ These two cases represent the most common methods employed in the mild form of primitive warfare. In the first case, that of open fighting, the affair is decided by champions and hence the loss of life is necessarily small, while in the second instance, where the tactics are ambush and surprise, the loss on both sides is likewise slight because the number waylaid is usually small and, the surprise once sprung, a retreat is always made, for the natives do not know how to fight in the open.

War on a destructive scale was both unknown and impossible in Fiji, in spite of the warlike character of the people, for they were armed with weapons no deadlier than the spear and the club and were split up into petty joint families, each bent upon defense rather than conquest.¹⁶ Polynesian warfare was also of slight consequence, for it frequently happened that not more than one man was killed,¹⁷ while generally the battle ended when an equal number were killed on both sides.¹⁸ In Samoa the methods of warfare were not conducive to great slaughter. After devoting a long time to an exchange of insults, the two sides would dash furiously at one another, and a series of single combats would ensue. "The event would be decided by the fall or the victory of some one great warrior and the consequent retreat or advance of his side. It was seldom possible to rally the fugitives; his back once turned, every man ran for his life."¹⁹ Turner,²⁰ a first-hand authority on the Samoans, states that he has never known of a loss in their battles greater than fifty killed on either side. That war was not bloody in Savage Island is indicated by the following incident. The king, Tongia, in relating the prowess of his forefather, "the greatest warrior in the world," showed Mr. Lawes the spot where his ancestor had engaged in combat with the "second greatest warrior." Mr. Lawes, seeing that the

space was confined, asked which of them was killed. "Oh, neither of them," the king replied. This historic duel Thompson²¹ considers as a fair example of Savage Island warfare.

Wars among the Tasmanians soon ended, without great loss of life.²² In Australia, battles properly speaking do not occur. The fights of the natives lead to neither slaughter nor spoils and are devoid of the ordinary consequences which follow battles and victories in civilized countries. "When one has been killed, both parties usually retire at once, and another battle may take place later. If nothing worse has happened then severe wounds, peace is made."²³ An encounter rarely lasts more than half an hour. Fighting might even be classed among Australian amusements. "The blacks are a bit Celtic in that way; some are real fire-eaters, always spoiling for a row. But in most everyday rows the feelings are more damaged than the bodies."²⁴ The chief weapon used is the tongue, and insults are a preliminary to every battle. Parker,²⁵ who has been acquainted with the natives of northwestern New South Wales since childhood, says: "An old gin in a rage will say more in a given time, without taking breath, than any human being I have ever seen; it is simply physiologically marvelous. You listen in dread of a tragedy; you hear the totem and multiplex totems of her opponent being scoffed at, strung out one after another, deadly insult after deadly insult. The insulted returns insult for insult; result, a lively cross fire. It lulls down; the insults are exhausted, quietude reigns. Some one makes a joke, all are laughing together in amity. From impending tragedy to comedy the work of a few minutes. A mercurial race indeed, but not a forgetful one. A black fellow never forgives a broken promise, and he can cherish a grudge from generation to generation as well as remember a kindness."

Fights among the northern tribes of Central Australia generally consist of a series of single combats to which the participants are challenged individually after the challenger has recited his accusations, such as not mourning properly when his father-in-law died, killing his brother, undue familiarity with his lubra, and so forth. A few wounds are the only results.²⁶ As a rule, fights in Central Australia are accompanied by much noise and little bloodshed. In an intertribal conflict, the attackers usually march up to the enemy's camp and engage in a battle of words. This lasts for perhaps an hour or two, after which things quiet down, and all is over. In some cases, however, a fight, in which severe wounds may be inflicted, takes place. In still other cases the attacking party steals down upon the enemy and, lying in ambush, waits

for an opportunity to spear one or two men without incurring any risk to itself.²⁷

Fighting seldom occurs in West Victoria, and even in these unusual cases it rarely results in a general skirmish but is limited to single combats between warriors on each side, who step into the arena, taunt one another, exchange blows, and wrestle together. "The first wound ends the combat. This is often followed by an encounter between the women, who begin by scolding, and arouse each other to fury, tearing each other's hair, and sticking one another with their yam-sticks or muurong poles. There is no interference by the men, however severely their wives may punish each other. Both men and women, when quarrelling, pace about, tossing up the dust with their toes, stamping, and making a hissing noise like 'ishew' or 'eeshwuur.' Every license is allowed to the tongue. They wish each other all kinds of evil in the coarsest and most violent language. The mildest imprecations are such as—'May your teeth project, and your eyes squint and be closed with small-pox;' 'May you lose your hair and be completely bald;' 'May you have a deformed nose;' 'May you break your neck and become a skeleton, for you should have died long ago;' and 'May many assist in putting you to death.' Words failing to produce the desired effect, they will spit in each other's faces."²⁸ The same general method of fighting prevails throughout Victoria, where battles are often decided by champions from each side, the casualties being limited to wounds and an occasional death. Frequently a war is concluded without any loss of life.²⁹

Thomas once witnessed a battle among the natives of Victoria in which the two hostile tribes advanced to each other, sat in silence for about half an hour, then accused one another of wrongdoing, and finally amid terrible howls and execrations engaged in battle—making frantic gestures, throwing dust in the air, dancing and yelling. The women took part with their yam sticks. "Finally, the head-men, after much discussion, settled the differences, and this great battle was finished." Not a life was lost, but six men were severely wounded. In all the frays that he has seen, Thomas has never known more than one person to be killed.³⁰ In practically all parts of Australia the native fights are conducted in this general manner.

Among the ancient Greeks, warfare in spite of its prevalence appears to have been not very disastrous. The war between the Achaeans and the Trojans, for example, was in the main a succession of single combats, such as those between Hector and Telamonian Ajax, Hector and Achilles, Paris and Menelaus; hence the loss of life was not great. Von Hahn³¹ has counted the number of men definitely stated to have

been killed in the battles of the *Iliad*. The total is three hundred and eighteen, including the twelve Trojan captives whom Achilles slew at the funeral of Patroclus. It must be remembered, however, that in Homer, as in other epics, "the terrific deeds of single champions receive an entirely disproportionate share of attention; the common man appears to have been quite eclipsed."³² Among the common soldiers and civilians the number slain may have been large.

The conflicts on the plains of Troy may be compared in general to those of the forces of David and Saul with the Philistines, wherein the issue of the war was decided by a single combat between David and Goliath.³³ Similar single combats are to be found in the literature of other peoples. In Herodotus³⁴ the Tegeatan commander tells of the mythical combat between Hyllus, leader of the Heraclidae, and the chief of the Peloponnesian forces. In a similar way the conflict of the Horatii and the Curatii decided the quarrel between the Romans and the Albans, and a single combat occurred between the Roman leader and a Gallic chieftain.³⁵ "Not far from the beginning of the sixth century B.C., Pittacus, the ruler of Mytilene, was challenged to single-combat by Phrynon, leader of the opposing Athenian forces, and the conflict received notoriety only because Pittacus threw a fisherman's net over his antagonist, and slew him while he was entangled therein. Apparently this caused a charge of foul play, for the single-combat did not decide the war."³⁶

Among the Bedouins, although it is true that a tribe seldom enjoys a moment of peace with all its neighbors, war between two tribes is scarcely ever of long duration, and comparatively few combatants are killed. Arab warfare is one of partisans; general battles are rarely fought. "To surprise the enemy by a sudden attack, and to plunder a camp are chief objects of both parties. This is the reason why their wars are bloodless; the enemy is generally attacked by superior numbers, and he gives way without fighting, in hopes of retaliating on a weak encampment of the other party." An Arab, moreover, never kills an unresisting foe, unless he has to avenge the death of some relative. The dread of blood revenge is so great that it prevents many sanguinary conflicts. "Two tribes may be at war for a whole year without the loss of more than thirty or forty men on each side." The Bedouins are so little accustomed to battles in which much blood is shed, that they are at a disadvantage in contests with foreign troops. Among themselves, when ten or fifteen men are killed in a skirmish, the circumstance is remembered for many years as an event of great importance. "If, therefore, in a battle with foreign troops several hundred are killed

in the first onset, and if any of their principal men should be among the slain, the Bedouins become so disheartened that they scarcely think of further resistance." The Bedouin mode of fighting consists principally in single combats, a method which is more suited to their dispositions, for they are "always anxious to know by whom a man has been killed—a circumstance which in promiscuous attack cannot easily be ascertained." "When two hostile parties of Bedouin cavalry meet, and perceive from afar that they are equal in point of numbers, they halt opposite to each other out of reach of the musket-shot; and the battle begins by skirmishes between two men. A horseman leaves his party and gallops off towards the enemy, exclaiming, 'O horsemen, O horsemen, let such a one meet me!' If the adversary for whom he calls be present, and not afraid to meet him in combat, he gallops forward; if absent, his friends reply that he is not amongst them. The challenged horseman in his turn exclaims, 'And you upon the grey mare, who are you?' The other answers, 'I am —— the son of ——.' Having thus become acquainted with each other, they begin to fight; none of the bystanders join in this combat, to do so would be treacherous action; but if one of the combatants should turn back, and fly towards his friends, the latter hasten to his assistance, and drive back the pursuer, who is in turn protected by his friends. After several of these partial combats between the best men of both parties, the whole corps join in promiscuous combat."⁸⁷ The loss of life, as stated above, is very small.

APPENDIX D

WARLIKENESS

THE Nootka tribes "were always at war with each other, hereditary quarrels being handed down for generations." The Puget Sound Indians were likewise "continually at war with each other, and with northern nations." The northern New Mexicans, "living in a state of constant war," were skilled in military tactics. "The Pimas wage unceasing war against the Apaches, and the Pueblos are ever at enmity with their neighbors, the Navajos."¹ The bloodthirsty Apaches never engaged in any pursuits except those of war and the chase, and they regarded the former as their chief occupation.² Not less warlike were the Indians of the lower Mississippi Valley, characterized as "very vindictive" and "in war irreconcilable enemies." They would often wait as many as eight days on the route of an enemy, living meanwhile on only a single ear of ground corn, in order to get his scalp.³

The aboriginal races of the northwest provinces of South America made war upon each other constantly until they were utterly exterminated by the Spaniards.⁴ Whereas thirty of the tribes in the valley of the Amazon are listed as being peaceful, eighty-three are specifically stated to be warlike, and fourteen of these are also cannibals. Many of the tribes are said to live in a state of continual feud among themselves, while most are so warlike that they attack any person who goes into their territory and are in amity with almost no other tribes.⁵ The Guaranis, like the natives of Brazil in general, "were ever in a state of perpetual war amongst themselves."⁶ According to Christison,⁷ inhumanity and love of bloodshed have become second nature to the Gauchos of Central Uruguay. The Canelos Indians are described as one of the most warlike tribes in South America, withstanding the attacks both of other Indians and of the Spaniards, and remaining until recently unconquered.⁸ The Bororo Indians were continually at war with their neighbors.⁹ The Mbayas lived by making war on all other tribes,¹⁰ while the Araucanians of Southern Chile kept up a continual state of warfare by making armed raids on the neighboring villages. The latter Indians were so indomitable and offered such resistance to the Spanish arms that within their territory colonies could be maintained only in the immediate vicinity of walled towns or fortified strongholds, and even

the most impregnable of these were time after time razed and their inhabitants massacred.¹¹ The Patagonians were said to be good-humored except in the prospect of a fight, when "their expression changed altogether, their glaring eyes and altered features manifesting unrestrained ferocity."¹²

War likewise predominates in the lives of the people of Oceania. The Milanows of Borneo, for example, are harassed on land by the Dyaks and at sea by the Lanuns, so that they live in constant fear of attack, whether on their plantations or fishing boats.¹³ The Kenyahs, like other tribes in Sarawak, "are an extremely warlike people, and are ever ready to defend themselves against attack or to make war on others."¹⁴ Roth¹⁵ says of the natives here and in British North Borneo that the worst features in their lives are the intertribal feuds which have been carried on amongst them from time immemorial, and which they themselves are totally unable to settle. The state of hostility is intensified by the custom of head-hunting which is prevalent on this island and elsewhere in this region. Quite recently in Celebes Island there were savage tribes, each possessing its own dialect and constantly at war with the others.¹⁶

The Papuans of New Guinea are separated into village units as a result of hostility, cannibalism, head-hunting, and divergences of language and religion.¹⁷ The various groups live in constant feud and warfare with each other. The people on the coast fear especially the attacks of those who inhabit the mountains in the interior. Hence they live in pile dwellings from which they can flee in case of sudden attack.¹⁸ The Binandere-speaking tribes on this island "are frankly cannibal and distinctly warlike," and live in constant enmity with surrounding tribes.¹⁹

Because of the yearly slave hunts in Dutch New Guinea, the natives are afraid to leave their own territory. The villages by Santani Lake are in continual feud; the Dorehsen and Arfak people have from time immemorial been on the warpath. The inhabitants of Adie Island are at war with those on the coast. The population of Geelvink-Bay fear the Biask pirates who attack them frequently. The Vandammen in the north appear to have sworn the extermination of the Mefur race. The inhabitants of Yap are continually in feud with the coast dwellers, while in the west the Tugeri have so frequently attacked and plundered the Wassi and Maut that the latter have abandoned their permanent dwellings and become nomads. The Alfurs and Ati-Ati people have continually attacked the villages in the north.²⁰ Both Malays and

blacks appear to be furious in war; this is particularly true of the Motu of southeast New Guinea.²¹

The Murray Islanders are noted for their fighting propensities.²² When excited, the natives of Timorlaut are "savagely cruel."²³ The Ponapeans are described as "hardy and intrepid warriors,"²⁴ as are the other natives of the Caroline group.²⁵ The Solomon Islanders are notorious for warlikeness, vandalism, and treachery.²⁶ The entire Fijian archipelago is seldom free from war.²⁷ In New Caledonia, "wars are incessant, for the country is divided into many small nations, who are always jealous and doing their utmost to injure each other."²⁸ The Melanesians in general are characterized by a "savage, bloodthirsty disposition, the practice of cannibalism, the existence of hostile tribes in the same islands who have little or no intercourse with one another, and, as a consequence of this, the existence of different languages in one group of islands, or even on the same island."²⁹ In Polynesia, affairs were little different, for the tribes "were constantly in a state of warfare."³⁰ The natives of Savage Island have been attributed with "the ferocity of wild boars," while the Marquesas Islanders have been described as "a very savage set of people" broken up into hostile tribes and practising cannibalism.³¹ In Easter Island "cruel wars and fights frequently occurred."³²

The Tasmanians were very bellicose and waged war incessantly.³³ The Australian tribes differ among themselves in regard to warlike disposition, but it is "seldom that any one is wholly free from a state of war."³⁴ Their fighting was generally of the bloodless type, yet they were constantly on the *qui vive*. "The life of an aboriginal was one of trouble. He lived in dread of his enemies. Sometimes he was not able to keep a fire in his camp lest it should light some secret foe to his place of shelter. At other times he himself would have some wrong to redress, and would then act on the offensive, and strive to kill some one for some fancied wrong. Sometimes their camps were surprised while the men were away hunting. The hunters would return to find most of the women who happened to be at home murdered, and some of the younger ones taken away to be wives for their enemies. Thus they often had real grievances to avenge."³⁵ The Maoris of New Zealand were notorious for their fighting propensities.³⁶ War was a passion with them, and among the causes of their decay is peace, which has deprived them of what was their predominant interest in life and induced them to leave their old fortified villages on the hills and live in damp swampy ground near their potato cultivations.³⁷

The ancient civilized peoples were well trained in the art of war. The

history of Egypt and of Babylonia is written around war.³⁸ The Arabs were originally extremely warlike,³⁹ nor did they abate their zeal under the Caliphs.⁴⁰ The Jews conducted many wars, civil as well as inter-tribal, and exulted in truly barbaric fashion over the destruction of their enemies.⁴¹ The Homeric age was one of violence, and war was almost as general as peace. Arms were a man's natural accompaniment, and war was looked upon as the proper work of man from youth even to old age.⁴² The Mongolians under Genghis Khan and Tamerlane displayed all the ferocity of barbaric warfare.⁴³

At the present time the half-civilized tribes of northern Africa and the Ottoman Empire regard war as the normal course of existence. Like hardy mountaineers the world over, the Berbers of Morocco are essentially an independent and warlike race. "The petty warfare which is incessant among them renders their tenure of life very uncertain, and there is a saying that the Arab fears hunger and is starved; the townsman fears death from too fast living, and kills himself thereby, while the Berber fears murder and is assassinated." Because of the constant state of internal strife—in which it is not only a case of tribe against tribe and of family against family, but often of individual against individual—the Berbers have long remained under the Arab yoke. The Sultan used to undertake an expedition against them every summer to extend his rule or to collect tithes.⁴⁴ The Arab tribes are "in a state of almost perpetual war against each other; it seldom happens that a tribe enjoys a moment of general peace with all its neighbours." This is true of the Wahábys as well as the Bedouins.⁴⁵ The Kurdish tribes of the Ottoman Empire are also in a chronic state of war.⁴⁶ Even today among the outlying Christian tribes in High Albania the families live in stone towers two or three stories high with no windows but only loopholes for rifles.⁴⁷

APPENDIX E

WARLIKE TRIBES IN AFRICA

THE life of the Afar and Somali is "a permanent passage at arms, upon which he alone remains victor who knows how to handle his weapons quickly and dexterously. . . . To be unarmed is looked upon by the Somali and Afar the same as being naked."¹ War and the stress of war play the most important rôle in the social life of northeast Africa. Civil wars, that is, wars against members of brother tribes, are rife in both Somaliland and Gallaland. In the south the Somalis carry on a war of extermination against the Gallas, while both peoples are constantly on the defensive against the incursions of the Ethiopians of Sehoa and Harar.² Each clan, among the Dinkas, is at war with all the others, and the Agar, the most numerous and warlike clan, is a source of dread to all its neighbors.³ The tribes of the Sudan are so broken up into small hostile groups that the natives can give very little information about one another.⁴ Writing of the natives of Azimba and Chipitaland, Angus⁵ says, "I found the people warlike and hardy, living, as they always do, at war with some one—fighting is second nature to them." North from Equatorial Africa, in the zone where Moorish and Mohammedan blood have become somewhat mixed, in those regions where barbarism has followed savagery, warfare is still the normal condition of the people.⁶ Unsettled, warlike tribes in a chronic state of armed resistance to everyone, are to be met from central Africa to the east coast.⁷

The most warlike people in East Africa are the Masai, who are a scourge to the district. They forbid passage through their territory "by placing in the middle of the path, over which an individual or a caravan must pass, a bullet over which they cross two twigs stripped of foliage, with the exception of a tufted top; the first person crossing this barrier is usually speared or shot."⁸ Between the pastoral and agricultural Masai civil war usually prevails,⁹ while the pastoral Masai are continually at enmity with all the neighboring tribes. Perpetual warfare reigns between the Masai and Akikuyu.¹⁰ The latter have been so inspired with terror by the raids of the Masai warriors that caution is now second nature to them. For purposes of defense they build their villages on hilltops and hillsides even though such sites necessitate the

transportation of water, firewood, and other supplies from a long distance.¹¹ Fear of invasion has caused the Wa-taveta tribe to fortify its villages by fortress gates made by the interweaving of long forest trees. These form such intricate and tortuous approaches that it is impossible for a stranger to thread them with any certainty of attaining the heart of a village.¹² The Masai themselves have to be in constant preparedness against surprise attacks. They build their kraals on some elevated spot in the middle of a big plain, and they post guards continuously on the outskirts of each camp.¹³ So jealously have the warlike Theraka guarded their country that the Masai have never raided them.¹⁴

South of the Shambala mountains lives another truculent tribe, the Zegulas.¹⁵ In the Baringo district raids and counter-raids, forced migrations and annihilations have been the order of the day.¹⁶ South of this district, in Nyassaland, the tribes are invariably warlike. As a result of their constant fighting they have become classified into (a) dominant tribes which have expanded at the expense of others, (b) tribes which have not in the past shown any strong warlike tendency but have managed to hold their own, and (c) slave tribes, those who have succumbed.¹⁷ In Northeast Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa the history of the natives has likewise been one of chronic war with all its vicissitudes.¹⁸ In Madagascar the Sakalavas "have had constant wars with their neighbors above the hills, as well as among themselves. A dread of their courage and skill in war has established between them and those neighbors a no-man's land of fifty or sixty miles in breadth."¹⁹ For ages they have been at feud with their Hova neighbors, and both peoples are ever ready to raid one another.²⁰

In Southeast Africa is the Zulu kingdom, established by success in arms. It has been a never-ending source of terror to all the surrounding tribes.²¹ The Basuto are the most warlike and intrepid of the tribes in Bechuanaland, where warfare is in the normal course of events.²² The Atharaka are described as being very hot-tempered and excitable. Amongst them an argument rapidly flares up into a brawl and from a brawl into a fight. "Even the old men and chiefs get very excited over the most trivial matters, and rage like angry children."²³ Until pacified, the Bawenda of Southwest Africa were harassed by constant war, both foreign and civil. They were particularly troubled by Zulu hordes invading their country, but when in no danger from invaders they made war among themselves. This occurred especially after the death of a chief, when the chieftainship was fought for by rival factions. The assistance of the Boers was occasionally called in, but failure to keep

promises resulted in wars with them, so that the whole history of the Bawenda is written around war.²⁴

The inhabitants of the Upper Welle District, Belgian Congo, form five distinct tribes. Each keeps aloof from the others, holds tenaciously to its own rites and customs, and lives on terms of intermittent war and peace with its neighbors. One of these tribes is the Pygmies, who may be called professional fighters.²⁵ The tribes about the Niger Delta often fight among themselves,²⁶ while the chief characteristic of the Ashantis, Houssas, and Kassas is "their warlike dispositions, and desire to attest their independence even against the greatest powers."²⁷ The Tshi-speaking peoples are very militaristic; all the men are divided into town companies, and the whole organization is directed toward war.²⁸ The Ewe-speaking peoples, especially the natives of Dahomey, are even more bellicose. Through waging war incessantly, the Dahomans have built a strong military kingdom.²⁹ Another great West African monarchy is Benin. Before it was destroyed, it had pursued a career of conquest which laid waste many neighboring districts.³⁰

APPENDIX F

INSTANCES OF SERIOUS WARFARE

WAR was on the whole very disastrous among the natives of the New World. In the former battles of the Eskimos about Bering Strait, "the victors killed all they could of the males of the opposing side, even including infants, to prevent them from growing up as enemies. The dead were thrown in heaps and left."¹ In some of the encounters of the Tlinkits of Alaska there were "terrible butcheries."² The tribes of British Columbia totally destroyed the villages of their enemies and carried off into slavery all the women and children they could seize.³ The Puget Sound Indians generally lost many of their people in battle.⁴ Displacement through war was the regular state of affairs among the North American Indians. In general the aim of their warfare was to destroy, and "as every person, old or young, was a part of the present or future strength of the enemy, neither age nor sex was spared and no noncombatants were recognized."⁵ In Mexico there was immense loss of life, largely accounted for by the sacrifice of prisoners of war; indeed, wars were instigated primarily for the purpose of securing such victims. Biart⁶ states that the number of persons annually immolated was at least twenty thousand.

Among the wild tribes of Central America, "battles were frequent and sanguinary."⁷ The warlike tribes of the valley of the Amazon were often engaged in deadly conflict. In a bloody battle fought in 1736, the Shipibos routed and almost exterminated the Setebos. In 1788 a tribe called by their neighbors Paiguizé, "cutters off of heads," entirely vanquished the Muras. The Mundrucus—the Spartans among the Indians of north Brazil—have annihilated the Jumas, and the bloodthirsty Botocudos have completely wiped out the Maconis. The Macus, like many other tribes, often attack the houses of their enemies and murder all the inmates.⁸ War among the Guaranis was to the death, and every sort of truce was unknown to them,⁹ while among the Botocudos neither man, woman, nor child was spared in battle.¹⁰ The Jívaros,¹¹ like the Araucanians of southern Chile,¹² burned the cities of their Indian and Spanish enemies and massacred all the male inhabitants who did not succeed in escaping. The Záparos, who were the terror of surrounding tribes, killed all the men they could and carried off the women and children.¹³

In Africa war has been and continues to be even more destructive. While it is true that some of the wars, especially among the tribes in the northeast, entailed but little loss of life, there are many instances, on the other hand, where the loss was considerable. Three thousand men fell in the encounter between the Wuêma and Mudajto in 1835; 822 were killed in the battle of Merka; one Galla alone slew 520 men during his lifetime. These figures appear remarkable when it is remembered that the natives fought not with firearms but with lances.¹⁴ The destructiveness of war in northeast Africa is further seen in Koettlitz's¹⁵ account of conditions among the Bertas after the Abyssinians had raided them. "The huts had been levelled, the crops destroyed by fire, and the live stock killed or driven off. Most of the inhabitants who had escaped death or capture had fled to remote parts of the country." Throughout the early part of his narrative of the journey of discovery of the source of the Nile, Captain Speke¹⁶ refers, page after page, to the ravages committed by the Watuta. Lieutenant Cameron¹⁷ writes that he found village after village deserted owing to the arrival of the same people who destroyed everything which they could not plunder and when one country was desolated they sought spoil in fresh fields. The natives were afraid to resist them, as any opposition resulted in indiscriminate slaughter.

In Central Africa, Mungo Park and Cameron met with evidences of the utter destruction caused by African wars.¹⁸ In the Uganda Protectorate, during the last half century, the Banyoro, when not fighting amongst themselves, have been continually raiding and destroying other tribes. "In their internecine wars the Hima aristocracy must have destroyed during the last fifty years a quarter of a million people according to native accounts."¹⁹ The warlike Masai would slay every man and boy in the first ardor of battle. In 1904 they slaughtered nearly all of the Awa-Wanga warriors, surprising them as they were scattered about in the woods.²⁰ The Laikipiak were an absolute scourge to all the surrounding tribes in the Baringo District until they were themselves annihilated by the Naivasha Masai. The Turkana were driven out of their territory by the Samburu, but when the latter tribe was exterminated they reoccupied their lands and are now driving other tribes before them. The history of the Suk is simply one of migrations and a life-and-death struggle with all the neighboring tribes. The Segellai once made a sudden raid on the Doigio, "killing enormous numbers of them." This incursion so shattered the strength of the Doigio that they were later driven by their old enemies to eke a precarious existence in the mountains. The Segellai themselves were subsequently extermi-

nated by a combination of their foes.²¹ On the coast are the Swahilis, whose history consists merely of a series of Arab conquests. The group is now half Negro, half Arab.²² The Atharaka have been driven from one place to another.²³ The inhabitants of the southern end of Lake Nyassa have been continually overrun by invading tribes from the east.²⁴ The Ayao, Angoni and other peoples of Nyassaland, Rhodesia, and Portuguese East Africa have up to the present time been constantly at war, making slave raids in every direction and holding conquered tribes in subjection.²⁵

Wars in South Africa have been so deadly that entire tribes have disappeared.²⁶ "When a country is conquered it is the custom to kill all the male population, take the women and children prisoners, and educate the latter as warriors for the victorious tribe, or enslave them. In this way whole tribes have ceased to exist. We know that Livingstone mentions a powerful tribe of the Basutos on the Upper Zambezi, named the Makololo, but if we now visit those parts we find that the only representatives of that tribe are women and children, and one man. The latter was spared because the daughter of the king took a liking to him, but all the other male adults have been killed." The Bakgalagadi tribes have been despoiled of all their cattle and driven into the desert. They are now serfs.²⁷ The country of the Bakalahari has been utterly devastated by the Ajawas.²⁸ In the last part of the eighteenth century the Zulu monarchy was founded on the basis of a large, well-disciplined standing army, and the Zulus then entered upon a career of conquest which extended northward from the 30th to the 3rd degree of south latitude. They carried all before them, raiding, ravaging, and slaughtering. The destruction they wrought throughout this entire section was tremendous.²⁹ A striking example of the effect of Zulu warfare is furnished by the ten tribes which formerly lived in the district between the Limpopo and the Zambezi. The men of these tribes were all killed; the women and children were captured and amalgamated by the Zulus. A new population has thus supplanted the old.³⁰

The Bushmen of South Africa have suffered terribly from invading forces. "Their greatest crime being that they were the original possessors of the soil, a war of extermination was waged against them, until at last the miserable remnant of their once numerous race had to struggle for a precarious existence in a few almost inaccessible mountain fastnesses or in the wilds of the Kalahari desert."³¹ Tribe after tribe pressed down from the north, each arrival being stronger and more powerfully armed than the preceding one. After six different waves of invasion by natives, the Dutch settlers came upon the scene and treated

the Bushmen ruthlessly. The Kaffirs 'until recently would kill the Bushmen without distinction of age or sex, when and where they might find them.³² The result of all this encroachment may be inferred from Holub's³³ statement, made in 1881, that within a hundred years the Bushmen had been reduced to about two per cent of their former number.

Until quite recently the chiefs of the Bawenda in Southwest Africa "settled their political differences quite independently by war, by invasions with murderous surprises of the enemy during the night or in the early morning, by incendiarism, pillaging and waylaying." During the last two centuries the Bawenda country has been the scene of frequent disturbances by war both foreign and internecine. The Bawenda were invaded by the Zulus, the Bapedi and others, and when not repelling foreign invaders they were torn by civil war.³⁴ The population of the Ba-Mbala has been kept down by war and cannibalism. They were driven from their country south of the Wamba to their present location. At that time many of their people were killed or enslaved. Among themselves, in real war, "no quarter is given to the wounded, and women and children are killed if caught. Each man fights for himself, and does his best to kill any enemy."³⁵ They have recently been encroached upon by the Ba-Yaka, who are extending their own territory. The latter people do not mingle with the tribes they supplant; they either enslave them or drive them out.³⁶

Wars were frequent and bloody among the warlike Ba-Huana, and in some cases lasted for years.³⁷ In southwestern Congo Free State, displacement of the weaker tribes by the stronger, devastation of whole tracts of country, and enslavement of innumerable people have followed as a result of the many wars which have troubled that country. In the war of the Ba-Pindi with the Ba-Djoke, for instance, a huge strip of land was laid waste. It is still uninhabited, though traces of destroyed villages may be found. This artificial desert extends from the Kwengo to the Loange.³⁸ In the Belgian Congo the same general consequences have occurred, accompanied by the dispersal of the remnants of vanquished tribes and the loss of national existence.³⁹ In Nigeria the growth of population was greatly retarded by war. Now that fighting has been stopped, population is increasing.⁴⁰

On the Slave Coast of Africa is the military kingdom of Dahomey, which has been a scourge to the entire district. Entered upon a career of conquest, the Dahomans have ruthlessly destroyed villages and slaughtered all the inhabitants with the exception of those destined for slavery. Ellis⁴¹ says that the number of lives lost during these wars for supremacy may be estimated from Dalzel's statement that 80,000

skulls, principally those of Andras alone, were placed by the Dahomey King Trudo on his palace walls. The kings of Benin, West Africa, waged continual war against their neighbors. They devastated the country and sacrificed countless prisoners of war.⁴²

Savage warfare in India knew no alleviation. Among the Nagas, a people who "did not seem to have the slightest idea of the value of life," and among kindred tribes of Manipur and Eastern Assam, blood feuds and relentless raiding have left their indelible mark. The natives were in a constant state of preparedness; their dwellings and villages were fortifications. War was so frequent and deadly that each little village perched on a hilltop had to be self-sufficient. The loss of life in their intertribal wars may be estimated by the number of skull trophies ornamenting their morongs. In some of these guardhouses the number reaches far into the hundreds.⁴³ Until recently the tribes of the Chin Hills periodically raided the people of the plains. They almost annihilated the border tribes of Ava.⁴⁴ In like manner the natives of Sungei Ujong were constantly raided by the Malays, who killed the men and captured the women and children.⁴⁵

Intertribal feuds in Borneo have ever harried the country.⁴⁶ The Kayans almost completely wiped out the smaller neighboring tribes and made slaves of the weaker ones.⁴⁷ They destroyed many agricultural districts.⁴⁸ "There is no doubt but that the dominant and aggressive Sea Dyak is a ruthless destroyer of tribes, which, owing to an inherent and fatal weakness, are already tottering to the verge of extinction."⁴⁹

In certain parts of New Guinea, owing to continual warfare, the population—especially the male portion—has been decimated. There are villages where at least two-thirds of the inhabitants are females.⁵⁰ The Tugeri raiders have devastated whole districts, exterminated entire tribes, and forced many others to abandon their permanent dwellings and to become nomads.⁵¹ Similar raiding by the Binandere-speaking peoples has shattered a large number of tribes.⁵² The Murray Islanders have likewise raided the neighboring islands as well as the mainland of New Guinea.⁵³

The Solomon Islands bear similar witness of the destructiveness of savage warfare. "Tribe after tribe has been completely wiped out by certain powerful chiefs."⁵⁴ The native population of the Russell Island group has been almost totally destroyed, and but few are left in Ysabel.⁵⁵ Between them the natives of Rubiana and those of Rendova Island have completely destroyed the inhabitants of the large adjacent islands. They fell upon the once populous island of Marovo within recent years and reduced the number of inhabitants from about five hun-

dred to considerably less than one hundred. In 1891 when Commander Davis, in H.M.S. *Royalist*, burned and sacked Rubiana, he found the beach absolutely littered with skulls, the stored and cherished trophies of years. In one village, on a small island which the Rubiana natives attacked, they took every head in the place.⁵⁶ Similar conditions prevailed throughout all the Solomon Islands.⁵⁷

Polynesian warfare, although incessant, was not very destructive.⁵⁸ The case of the Samoans, who filled up the wells of their enemies and destroyed the fruit trees, appears to have been exceptional.⁵⁹ These people had a custom known as *malo*, which "went so far as to slay the vanquished when he approached with signs of submission, to carry off his wife and children, and ravage his fields and houses, or else to a gradual ruining of him by extortion." This practice "not infrequently compelled the flames of revolt to break out afresh. Whole tribes have been known to migrate in order to escape oppression of this kind. In 1848 the whole population of Western Upolu removed to the eastern part of the island."⁶⁰

Among the Ainu of Japan, night raids, in which men were murdered in their sleep, were frequently made by one town upon another. These internecine wars, together with the wars of extermination carried on by the Japanese against them, have greatly decreased the population.⁶¹ Tribal dissensions among the Tasmanians contributed considerably to their decrease in numbers and so weakened them that they were an easy prey to the whites. It is said that "their quarrels never died out except with the extinction of their enemies."⁶² However that may be, wars among themselves were not nearly so calamitous as their war with the white settlers. In the latter case they resorted to means in self-defense which they appear never to have used among themselves. They "destroyed the herds, burnt the isolated houses and massacred the inhabitants without distinction of age or sex. Not content with killing their victims, they tortured them. They also emasculated them; and the Tasmanian women, armed with sharp stones, set upon the wounded to complete this work of vengeance."⁶³ The Tasmanians, as is well known, were completely annihilated by the whites. There is not a single representative of the race today.

An exception to the absence of real warfare in Australia is the case, mentioned by Creed⁶⁴ in 1878, of the Yaldaigan who almost exterminated the Gudan of Cape York. War as conducted by the Maoris of New Zealand was savage in every sense of the word. Agricultural districts were laid waste, and hundreds of the enemy were taken prisoner to be eaten later.⁶⁵ So great was the loss of life that a custom of "caus-

ing men to grow" was practiced for the purpose of repairing defeat in war. "Solemnly would both sexes devote themselves to the work of increasing their numbers," in order to have a large body of warriors at some future date to wage war.⁶⁶

APPENDIX G

WAR FOR BOOTY

THE more serious wars in the northeastern part of Africa are those undertaken in the lust of robbery.¹ Among the Somalis predatory wars have the upper hand, while across the continent, in the track of the caravans, are robber tribes which regard the latter as their legitimate prey. Such a tribe are the Tangale, who inhabit the hills near the main road between Gatri and Pongru and make raids from their strongholds on caravans traveling that way.² The Yalunka people, like others in West Africa, have established themselves along the main highway to the interior, where they plunder the passing caravans and traders. By this means they have become rich and powerful.³ One to two hundred miles inland from the east coast of Africa numerous tribes are to be found, which are "neither far enough away from the coast quietly to produce, nor sufficiently near to it peaceably to trade." They are therefore in a chronic state of armed resistance to everyone, and in most cases powerful enough to demand a share in the passing trade.⁴

The pastoral Masai of East Africa attack and rob the Arab and Swahili caravans.⁵ These natives are "true warriors and raiders," who "know no law but that of capture;" their main object in waging continual war is to obtain plunder.⁶ Like the Suk and others, they have special rules for dividing the spoil in order to adjust the inevitable disputes that arise.⁷ Further south on the east coast are the Angoni, who are ever raiding their neighbors. Around Lake Nyasa pillaging other tribes is frequent. Throughout Southeast Africa the Zulus have raided and robbed in every direction.⁸

Desire for booty has long been a prevalent cause of war among the tribes along the west coast of Africa. Those of Angola would fight on any occasion for the sake of plunder, while wandering tribes of marauders have constantly disturbed the whole region.⁹ Among the Bawenda, pillaging was common. Theft was a frequent cause of war among the Bageshu, the Ba-Yaka, the Ba-Huana, and the Ba-Mbala.¹⁰ The life of the latter people centers round the system of palaver, or trial, to settle cases of theft between individuals or neighboring tribes. The whole population comes armed to the proceedings, which begin by accusations of theft made by some person. The accused may admit he stole the ar-

ticle, but did not the accuser's grandfather steal something from his father? If the latter does not deny it, he asserts that the former's uncle stole something from his grandfather's brother-in-law. And so the case proceeds, with charges and counter-charges, until the one who can bring the greater number of charges against his adversary wins. If compensation is not paid, war ensues.¹¹ Stealing is so frequently a cause of war among these people that the following custom has arisen: "If a goat is stolen from a neighbouring village, pieces of the flesh are sent to the villages allied to the village of the thief; the idea being that if war results, and, consequently, the allies have to run the risk of being killed, it is only fair that they should have had some of the spoil."¹²

The tribes of the Congo River district will raid one another's towns, carry off everything portable, and burn the houses to the ground.¹³ The wars of the natives in Togoland aim only at booty.¹⁴ In the neighboring state of Dahomey, the primary object of every campaign is to obtain plunder. While the standing army fights off the enemy, the men of the general levy pillage and ravage right and left, taking as much booty as they and their women can carry. "Dahomi may be likened to a vast association of banditti, who at fixed periods, generally in March or April, make raids upon their eastern neighbours, and return on the approach of the rains, laden with spoils."¹⁵ In like manner the kings of Benin waged incessant war on neighboring villages and tribes for the sake of booty.¹⁶

Desire for plunder was a frequent cause of war among the natives of India. The Angámi, as well as other Naga tribes, were "addicted to predatory cruel inroads for plunder."¹⁷ Marauding expeditions were always being undertaken by the Bhils, while raids and counter-raids were so much a part of Yusufzai national existence that every village was constantly on the alert.¹⁸ For the sake of loot the Swatis of the same region would attack the British. Raids were regularly made by the natives of the Chin Hills, while dakoity is so ingrained in the Burmans that they cannot be weaned away from it.¹⁹

The people of Tatana in New Guinea live by plunder. Along Gilfink Bay and among the islands near the northwest coast, piracy is a regular practice; in the west the Tugeri are ever on the warpath in order to obtain plunder.²⁰ Thefts committed by one tribe on another are one of the common causes of war in Borneo.²¹ The Solomon islanders are noted for their stealing propensities; robbery is a motive in all their expeditions.²² The Murray Islanders make frequent raids on the neighboring islands for the same purpose.²³ In Australia, by way of contrast, wars

are not caused by the desire for spoils, for the Australian possesses nothing to tempt the cupidity of another.²⁴

Evidence of war for booty in the New World is by no means lacking. The tribes of Sitka Island and the extreme northern part of America were perpetually in a state of warfare for that purpose.²⁵ The Tlinkits of Alaska used to regard war as their chief occupation, carrying it on partly for the sake of spoils.²⁶ The Similkameen Indians of British Columbia, on the other hand, are an exception; they are a peace-loving people and "have too much property to wish for war."²⁷ The case was just the opposite among the Salish tribes. One of them, the Siciatl, did not store their winter supplies in their dwellings but "cached" them in the woods. They never kept a large store of food on hand, because their marauding neighbors, the Yukeltas, "made periodical forays upon their settlement and carried off all they could lay hands upon."²⁸ Referring to the Southern Californians, Bancroft²⁹ writes: "War is a mere pretext for plunder." Cremony³⁰ says all the worldly goods of the Apaches are the result of their proficiency in war and the chase; they waged war chiefly for the purpose of plunder and constantly preyed upon the industrious Pima.

A perfect example of a robber tribe is the Mbayas of South America. It was a religious tenet that the deity had bidden them live by making war on all other tribes and carrying off all their goods.³¹ Robbery was part of the daily life of the Araucanians, who kept up a continual state of warfare with nearby villages by constantly making armed raids upon them.³² The Botocudos also made "expeditions to plunder the villages of their settled neighbors," while the Záparos would fight on any occasion when there was prospect of plunder.³³

APPENDIX H

BLOOD REVENGE

BLOOD revenge is an old national institution among the Somalis and Afara of northeast Africa. It binds every member, while the whole tribe may take upon itself the duty of revenge when an individual is slain. The Somali will not rest until he has taken blood revenge, and in his fury he quite often kills people in the opposing tribe who were known to be absolutely innocent. Blood revenge prevails among both peoples in the most inexorable form, and is set into motion even when a deathblow is struck in self-defense.¹ The fierceness of blood vengeance has been enhanced among the Hamites since their conversion to Islam, for they will now allow no mitigation of it against foreigners.²

In east central Africa crimes which affect the individual are considered a personal matter. If a murderer is caught and proved guilty he is turned over to the slain man's relatives, who have power to dispose of him as they choose.³ The Nilotic Kavirondo carry blood revenge even to the defiance of evil spirits which are supposed to have caused a death. During a funeral a fight with these invisible foes is waged by warriors who charge, retreat, and cower down behind their huge shields.⁴ Among the Bantu Kavirondo, warfare takes the form of a Corsican vendetta. Since one death demands another, murder leads to a long succession of crimes. The blood feud is handed down for generations. "If a man is killed, the sons of the deceased endeavour to hunt down the murderer, and if they fail, the sons again carry on the feud."⁵ When a feud is on, a man may not eat with a person with whom his branch of the family is at enmity, else, it is believed, he will surely die within twenty-four hours. Blood revenge is frequently taken advantage of, among the same people, as a means of redressing private grievances. Thus, if a man has suffered an injury at the hands of a member of his own clan, he will often proceed to the territory of a neighboring tribe, lie in ambush, and kill the first man he can. Soon it will become known who committed the deed, and the tribe of the murdered man will make war on the clan of the murderer, who thus obtains his revenge vicariously.⁶

Private justice and feud are ingrained in the Akikuyu of British East Africa. Murder within a native's own clan is considered a very

serious matter, much more so than killing a man belonging to another clan or tribe; this leads to group solidarity. "In former times, if a man of one clan killed another in some intertribal fight, the custom was for a brother to waylay and kill a man of the clan who had killed his brother, these two deaths cancelled each other."⁷ Thus blood revenge operated even in the case of death caused in war. Among another tribe in the same section, "if a murderer escapes, one of his clan is killed. This brings about a fight between the two clans."⁸ If a member of a neighboring tribe escapes after committing murder, his nearest male relative or, failing him, any male member of his clan may be killed. In what used to be German East Africa murder is avenged by the relatives of the murdered person "as a matter of worldly policy."⁹ All members of the murderer's tribe, clan, or caste, are responsible.

The same idea of group solidarity is evident among the Bageshu, for "if a man kills one of another clan, the members of the clan seek out either the murderer, or, failing him, some one of his clan about the same age as the person killed, and put him to death. If they are able they get a son of the murderer and they will sometimes wait a number of years until a child grows up in order to kill him when he reaches the age of the man who was murdered."¹⁰ The idea of like for like is thus literally and fully carried out. The members of a clan among the Bahima are bound by ties of social obligation. Each must be cared for in sickness, helped in distress, and avenged in death by the others.¹¹

The memories of the Ba-Mbala "are good only so far as the wrongs done by or to their ancestors are concerned; at their *milonga* (palavers) crimes committed three generations back are frequently mentioned and remembered by the hearers."¹² As among other tribes in this district, murder is one of the chief causes of war. Among the Ba-Yaka, the right of vengeance lies with the heir, though murder is regarded as an offense against the whole tribe.¹³ Blood revenge also exists among the Ba-Yanzi and the Ba-Kwese, and "a whole tribe will rise to punish a murder."¹⁴

The Bangala of the upper Congo River have good memories so far as wrongs committed against them are concerned. They make no distinction between premeditated and accidental homicide; since life has been taken, they feel that it must be dealt with as murder. The family avenges all cases of assault on any of its members. In a blood feud a record is kept of the number slain; when an equal number from each clan has been killed, the account is squared, but if a chief has been murdered, two deaths are needed to expiate the offense. Weeks¹⁵ mentions an instance among these people in which the avengers desired to

kill only one brother of a murderer, but in the general fight which occurred two brothers were slain. If only the one brother had been killed the feud would have ended, but now it had to continue, and it was the turn of the other family to go about in fear of their lives.

Revenge, especially for bloodshed, is everywhere practiced among the Bantu tribes of West Africa. The avenger of blood may not relinquish his duty until some member of the slayer's tribe has been killed. The duty devolves upon the blood relative first, the family next, and finally upon the tribe. "Formerly it was indifferent who was killed in revenge, so that it be some member of the murderer's tribe. Naturally that tribe sought to retaliate, and the feud was carried back and forth, and would be finally settled only when an equal number had been killed on each side. . . . There was no way of settlement except by bloodshed—a life for a life—except that, for the life of a woman, a woman and goods of a certain amount and kind might be accepted."¹⁶

Blood feuds prevail among the Dinkas of West Africa, and last for years after the original offense.¹⁷ This is true also of some Nigerian tribes, among whom murder is one of the chief causes of war. The children of a man killed even in battle will keep up a blood feud for years.¹⁸ Blood revenge is common to the tribes of Togoland; murder is almost always punished with death, the punishment being in the hands of the injured family. They believe that if revenge is not taken, the spirit of the murdered man will trouble them the rest of their lives.¹⁹

Among the Nagas and other frontier tribes of northeastern India, the custom of blood revenge is particularly active; revenge for the death of a relative is considered "a sacred duty never to be neglected or forgotten."²⁰ From childhood they are taught ever to revere it as one of their most sacred duties. Murder admits of no expiation, and if the male members of a family are lacking or are unable to take revenge, men may be hired to conduct a blood feud. "It is an article of faith that blood once shed can never be expiated, except by the death of the murderer or some of his near relatives, and though years may pass away vengeance will assuredly be taken some day. The blood feud of the Naga, as with the Corsican vendetta, is a thing to be handed down from generation to generation, an everlasting and baneful heirloom involving in its relentless course the brutal murders of helpless old men and women, innocent young girls and children, until, as often happens, mere family quarrels, generally about land or water, being taken up by their respective clansmen, break out into bitter civil wars which devastate whole villages."²¹ Blood feuds exist not only between tribes or villages, but also between clans or kin-groups within a village. Indeed, the intra-

village feuds are more bitter than the 'intervillage feuds. It often happens that a village is divided against itself, one clan being at deadly feud with another, whilst a third lives among them in a state of neutrality and at peace with both. United action by a village is therefore an impossibility. It is owing to this state of affairs that the tribes are broken up into small isolated groups perched on hilltops and always prepared for war.²²

To the Nagas the obligations of blood feud extend beyond the slaying of visible enemies to defiance of unseen foes. They come to a funeral in war equipment, and begin to sing as follows: "What divinity has taken away our friend? Who are you? Show yourself. If we had known of your coming we would have speared you." Then they shake their spears toward heaven in defiance of the evil spirit supposed to have caused the death. The system of blood revenge may occasionally work for peace. When every quarrel entails so serious a consequence as a blood feud between all the relatives on each side, the natives are reluctant to enter into them. This is true chiefly within a village.²³

For the same reason, the Kaupuis of Manipur are said to live in peace and happiness, because "the certainty of vengeance makes such [blood feuds] rare within a village, but blood feuds between two villages are never forgotten."²⁴ The Kuki-Lushai clans have a funeral practice similar to that of the Nagas. As soon as a man has breathed his last, "all present seize weapons and slash the walls, floor, and roof of the house, shouting, 'You have killed him, whoever you may be we will cut you in pieces.'"²⁵

Blood feuds are very common in the Garo Hills of Bengal. The clans "exercise their revenge on women and children alike."²⁶ The natives of the Chin Hills have innumerable feuds which have been handed down from generation to generation. A feud once started, blood is avenged in blood only to be avenged again in the same way. "Not only did the feud necessitate the spilling of the blood of descendants of the original disputants, but whole villages became involved and innocent blood was as freely spilled as that of the families at feud. No one was safe: the women worked in the fields guarded by the men; no one ever knew when raiders from many villages at feud with theirs were lying along the paths, and piquets kept guard night and day on the approaches to the villages."²⁷ The usual distinction between in-group and out-group members is made; murder is forbidden within a tribe and it rarely occurs when the natives are sober.

The Brahuīs of India constitute a confederacy united by common land and common blood feud. If a murder involving members of the

same family occurs a blood feud does not arise, for no one will assist the murderer, but if a member of one family-group is killed by a member of another, it is at once incumbent on the victim's relatives to take blood for blood. Each group is likely to be joined by others, until the whole tribe is engaged in a fratricidal struggle. Furthermore, if the slayer and the slain belong to different tribes, the feud may be taken up by these tribes, each of which may again be joined by other tribes, so that a small spark soon results in a large conflagration. Nor is the feud ended until a reckoning of death for death has been made and compensation paid to the group suffering the greater loss. This applies not only to the Brahuis, but to the Baloch and Afghans as well.²⁸

Joint responsibility and blood revenge prevail extensively in Malaysia.²⁹ The Malays have no notion of penalty other than private revenge.³⁰ In Borneo revenge often leads to war, a murder or some old blood feud being the usual exciting cause.³¹ Among the Veddahs of Ceylon, everyone takes punishment into his own hands and knows but a single penalty—death.³² Justice is similarly administered among the unwarlike Andamans. "Should a man kill his opponent nothing is necessarily said or done to him, though it is permissible for a friend or relative of the deceased to avenge his death; in most cases, however, the murderer succeeds in striking such terror in the minds of the community that no one ventures to assail him or even to express any disapprobation of his conduct while he is within hearing."³³

Justice is a personal matter in New Guinea, and blood revenge its usual form. Two motives appear to be involved: religion, for vengeance is considered a moral duty; and family affection, for attachment to one's relatives prompts one to avenge their injuries. Not only murder, but also witchcraft, theft, and rape call blood revenge into play, and even the slightest sickness will be revenged in the most bloody manner. Group responsibility prevails and blood revenge passes quickly into a blood feud, which is the most common cause of war. Vendettas may last for years and cause a great deal of bloodshed.³⁴

Among the people of Torres Straits, "all crimes were of a purely personal nature, and were individually revenged." Private vengeance led to public war when a blood feud drew in other clans. This was their most deadly type of war; no quarter was given, the weaker party was despoiled, and its women were murdered.³⁵ Through the operation of blood revenge, murder causes war in New Hebrides. If revenge is not obtained during the lifetime of the injured party, it is handed down to posterity. All the men of the murderer's group are held responsible for his act. This principle has even been applied to Europeans, who were

held responsible for murders committed by earlier arrivals.³⁶ In New Georgia there is no law but revenge, and the punishment of any offense is at bottom a personal matter.³⁷

Throughout Polynesia blood revenge is widespread and is the most frequent cause of war.³⁸ In Samoa, any member of the murderer's family, clan, or tribe, was as liable to be killed as the culprit himself. The murder of a chief was more serious than that of an ordinary person, and immediately led to war.³⁹ The Maoris held that "murder must be revenged by every member of the tribe until satisfaction has been obtained."⁴⁰ Blood for blood was the only law they knew, and it mattered little whose blood was shed as long as it was that of a member of the murderer's tribe. "A wrong done to any one by a member of another tribe was resented as though inflicted on the whole of his tribe."⁴¹ When revenge was taken, it frequently brought the two tribes into war, for the Maoris were extremely vindictive and would never pardon the least offense.⁴² "Vindictive purposes were handed down, from father to son, through generations. The latter never thought he had done his duty, until he had redeemed the honour, and fulfilled the dying wishes, of his sire or grandsire."⁴³ A chief, when dying, generally reminded his people of some revenge to be carried out, and often nominated a person to devote himself to this special purpose. These death orders were looked upon as sacred commands. Vengeance was regarded as propitiation by bloodshed.⁴⁴

Within the tribe, Maori transgressors were held accountable for their own deeds, and peace generally prevailed. This was in contradistinction to the intergroup relation, where any member of a tribe might be killed for a fellow tribesman's crime and where revenge was swift and sure. The result of this condition of affairs was to foster mutual distrust and fear, for "no tribe could tell when the storm of war might burst upon it, even from those with whom they were living in peace."⁴⁵ Blood revenge was sometimes used as an instrument against a member of one's own tribe by giving another group cause of war against it. The Maoris called this "putting your own people in the wrong." According to Tregear,⁴⁶ it would happen more or less as follows: A chief might feel insulted or vexed by some speech or act of a kinsman, his senior in rank or birth. Unable to attack his powerful adversary directly, he would go out and kill some member of a strong neighboring tribe, knowing that his kinsmen would have to support him in his quarrel and if not defeated, would probably lose heavily.

The native Australian knows no relationship but that of blood and no form of punishment except that blood must be shed for blood.⁴⁷

Every tribe is bound by the principle of joint responsibility, first, the responsibility of each tribesman for injuries done to another tribe by any of his comrades, and second, the duty of avenging wrongs against members of his own group.⁴⁸ Blood feud is thus incumbent on every member of the clan or tribe, and all murders must be avenged. Revenge is a sacred duty with which friendship is seldom allowed to interfere. "A man would consider it his bounden duty to kill his most intimate friend for the purpose of avenging a brother's death, and would do so without the slightest hesitation. But if an intimate friend should be killed he would leave revenge to the relatives of the deceased."⁴⁹ A distinction is made between crimes committed within the group and those perpetrated by a member of one tribe on a member of another. In the first case, the offense is regarded as much more heinous; to kill a member of one's own clan is "impious homicide."⁵⁰ Intragroup murder, although tabooed, is punished less severely than intergroup murder. The operation of the law of vengeance is curtailed within the tribe so as to avoid civil war, ordeal by combat being substituted for the blood feud.⁵¹ In intergroup relations, however, the death of the murderer or some of his tribesmen is usually demanded, and severe struggles result. This is the most frequent and persistent cause of war in Australia.⁵²

This situation is intensified by the fact that the native Australians have no concept of natural death but believe, in the case of a person dying from disease or other cause, that his death is produced by sorcery.⁵³ The death must be revenged, and, since the sorcerer is usually a member of another tribe, this belief becomes a common cause of war.⁵⁴ When anyone dies, even from senility, the medicine man is immediately called in to discover the sorcerer. As soon as some one is fixed upon, an armed avenging party consisting of young warriors sets out for the supposed sorcerer's village or tribe. Here they lie in ambush awaiting an opportunity to kill the culprit or some member of his tribe.⁵⁵ The avengers themselves are killed in retaliation, and thus a feud involving a constant destruction of life is begun.⁵⁶ These feuds frequently last for generations though sometimes they occasion but little bloodshed. Whole tribes may become involved. Howitt,⁵⁷ for example, mentions a feud which arose shortly after the settlement of Gippsland and not only brought in all the tribes in this region but spread to other districts as well.

Among the Yakuts, "the blood of a man, if spilt, required atonement. The children of the murdered took vengeance on the children of the murderer to the ninth generation."⁵⁸ The duty of blood revenge developed group solidarity; the members of a clan, zealous for one another's

honor, lived together in peace and cööperation. Their attitude toward other clans was quite different, and the obligation of blood revenge was frequently the cause of war.⁵⁹ In Kamtchatka, too, war was often caused by the operation of blood vengeance. In a case of murder involving two clans, the victim's relatives would go to the murderer's group and demand that it deliver the culprit to them for punishment by stoning to death. If it refused, a war of extermination would break out between the two clans.⁶⁰

The peaceful Greenlanders, who do not know the meaning of war, are nevertheless acquainted with bloodshed, for blood revenge is in force among them. The usual cause is murder. "The attack often takes place at sea, the murderer transfixing his victim from behind with his harpoon, or capsizing his *kiak* [canoe] and cutting a hole in it. . . . It is not the business of the community, but simply of the murdered man's nearest relatives, to take revenge for his death, if they are in a position to do so; and thus we find, even among this peaceful folk, traces of a sort of blood-feud, though the practice is but slightly developed, and the duty does not, as a rule, seem to weigh heavily upon the survivors."⁶¹ Among other groups of Eskimos, blood revenge exists in a more developed form and is fraught with more serious consequences. Among the Central Eskimos, "it is not a rare occurrence that a man who is offended by another man takes revenge by killing the offender. It is then the right and the duty of the nearest relative of the victim to kill the murderer."⁶² In case he cannot be apprehended, one of his relatives is killed instead. A feud is thus started which may last for a long time and even be handed down to a succeeding generation. Similarly with the Hudson Bay Eskimos, "in case of a premeditated murder, it is the duty of the next of kin to avenge the dead, though years may pass, while the murderer pursues his usual occupations undisturbed, before an opportunity occurs to the relative for taking him by surprise."⁶³ Among the Eskimos about Bering Strait, "blood revenge is considered a sacred duty, and it is a common thing to find men who dare not visit certain villages because of a blood feud existing, owing to their having killed some one whose near relatives live in the place." The duty of revenge belongs, as usual, to the nearest male kin; boys will wait until manhood to avenge their father's death. "A man who has killed another watches incessantly, and in the end his eyes acquire a peculiar restless expression which the Eskimo have learned to recognize at once." When the relatives and friends on both sides take up the quarrel so that whole tribes become involved, the blood feud issues in

war. In Alaska, cases involving both Eskimos and Indians have occurred.⁶⁴

Blood revenge was almost universal among the American aborigines and it lay at the root of much Indian warfare.⁶⁵ It was a common cause of war in the Aleutian Islands, where "blood, the only atonement for offense, must be washed out by blood, and the line of vengeance becomes endless."⁶⁶ Among the Tlinkits, blood revenge was one of the commonest incentives to war,⁶⁷ while in Sitka Island and the neighboring region the wars were "one long series of assassinations," undertaken to satisfy revenge, without distinguishing between the murderer and any member of his tribe.⁶⁸ Blood revenge was the chief cause of incessant war between the Nootka tribes, hereditary quarrels being handed down for generations. It also increased the losses of war, for, according to native notion, loss of life in battle can be forgotten only when an equal number of the hostile tribe have been killed.⁶⁹ Among the Haidas and inland Columbians, the kinsmen must revenge murder, and vengeance may lead to war. The same is true of the Central and Southern Californians and the Omahas, although compensation might at times be substituted.⁷⁰ With the Comanches, however, "all crimes may be pardoned but murder, which must pay blood for blood if the avenger overtake his victim."⁷¹ Among these people, it is said that brute force or the right of the strongest, with *lex talionis* in its widest acceptance, directs the mutual relations of tribes and individuals. The Indians of the lower Mississippi Valley are also very vindictive and "there are none who do not undertake to revenge the death of those of their relations who have been killed in war."⁷²

The Araucanians understand only the law of retaliation. A sudden attack is the result of killing a murderer belonging to another clan or tribe. Revenge has been a source of continual intertribal warfare.⁷³ The incessant wars of the Patagonians are ordinarily caused by vendettas of clan and clan or tribe and tribe.⁷⁴ Blood revenge is also a cause of war among the natives of Brazil.⁷⁵ The relation of private vengeance to public war is clearly seen among the Botocudos. "When a murder is done within the tribe, then of course vengeance lies between the two families concerned; but if the murderer is of another clan or tribe, then it becomes a public wrong. The injured community hold council, and mostly decide for war if they dare; then a war-party sets forth, in which the near kinsmen of the murdered man, their bodies painted with black daubs to show their deadly office, rush foremost into the fight. Among neighbouring tribes the ordinary way in which war begins is by

some quarrel or trespass, then a man is killed on one side or the other, and the vengeance for his death spreads into blood-feud and tribal war ever ready to break out from generation to generation."⁷⁶

APPENDIX I

WAR ADORNMENT

THE Somalis of Northeast Africa use ostrich feathers as a personal adornment to distinguish a man who has killed an opponent, either in open fight or by treachery.¹ Among the Wagogo of East Africa, "a man who kills one or more of his enemies (in battle, etc.) receives a goat as reward, and the victor paints a red circle around his right eye and a black circle around his left eye; he also paints his spear red at point and black in the middle. He holds the spear in his hand when dancing, in order that it may bear silent witness to his bravery."² The Masai, Zulu, and their kin adorn themselves with feathers to make a terrifying impression.³ The war dress of the Nyassaland tribes consists also of feathers and skins. "Men who have been conspicuous for bravery wear horn charms on the chest."⁴ The Baganda warriors paint one side of their face and chest red, the other black, and the nose white. The general is distinguished by special ornaments. A man who kills one of the enemy in battle wears a wreath of grass upon his head. "When a warrior has killed ten men in various battles, he presents his father with a cow and the shaft of one of the spears taken from a slain foe; the father kills a goat and makes his son a feast; during the feast the father burns the shaft of the spear in public to notify the number of those slain in battle by his son."⁵ Such recognition of warlike prowess makes a great appeal to vanity and incites to further efforts. The Ba-Yaka allow a man who has killed an enemy to wear an iron bracelet.⁶ The Bangala, in times of war, blacken the whole face with a thick paste of oil and soot, and surround the eyes with circles of chalk or white clay. The reason given is "to disguise them from their enemies," but this hardly seems probable.⁷

Among the Nagas of India, "warriors of distinction who had slain many people wore the hair of their victims depending from the side ornaments of the helmet which accumulated into a kind of fringe around the face."⁸ Sometimes they ornamented their shields with pieces of bearskin. These represent the heads of men slain in battle and are supposed to intimidate the foe who sees them. "All the Nagas' personal decorations have also a defensive purpose in view, like our old military stocks and epaulettes, and are planned to ward off the spear or axe, while the long hair which is so profusely used, waving about with every

movement of the wearer, distracts the eye of the foe levelling his spear at him, and disturbs the aim." The war adornment of the Angámi is graded: when a man becomes a warrior and has taken heads, he acquires the right to decorate his kilt with three rows of cowries, and in the case of a distinguished warrior, with four rows; for very conspicuous bravery the right is conferred to wear in the headdress the long tail feathers of the hornbill. The Rengmahs are particularly noticeable for the peculiar tail which they alone of all the Naga tribes wear. It is of wood, ornamented with tufts of hair and other objects, and fastened to the small of the back and suspended from the shoulders by a belt. "The tail is used in fight to signify defiance; they turn tails towards the enemy, and by hopping rapidly on each leg impart the defiant wag to the tail. 'Turning tail' with them means the reverse of what it does with us."⁹

The Kenyahs of Borneo make war coats of the skin of the tiger cat, but "such coats are worn only by men who have been on the warpath." They also have a few tiger skins, which none but a distinguished chief may venture to touch, much less wear as a war coat. Such skins are extremely rare and to possess one is a mark of great distinction.¹⁰ The Dyaks generally wear their best clothes and ornaments when going out to fight. Gomes¹¹ once asked a Dyak why this was done, because, as he pointed out to him, most of the finery they put on interfered with the free action of the limbs. The answer was that if they were well dressed, in case of their death, the enemy who saw the bodies would know that they were not slaves, but free men of some standing.

Warfare in New Guinea is the grand occasion for adornment. The body is daubed yellow and red before battle, and shell ornaments are fastened on.¹² At other times they have no covering at all. A special and peculiar ornament which is found among all the tribes is "kepore," which consists of a piece of tortoise shell ornamented with pigs' teeth and the seeds of a species of mimosa. It is a breast ornament and charm as well, and during an encounter, it is held between the teeth and is supposed to strike terror into the adversaries and give the wearer victory over them.¹³ The Alfurs adorn themselves richly for battle, and the number of feathers a man wears signifies the number of enemies he has already killed. It is considered a great honor to have these distinctive ornaments and the men are constantly incited to warlike deeds to win them.¹⁴ Among the tribes at Hood Point, twelve different distinctions in the wearing of ornaments are allowed to warriors who have taken life. One of these ornaments, called *pina*, consists of the upper mandible of the hornbill and is worn on the forehead; it is a very spe-

cial distinction, equal in value to the Victoria Cross. Only men who have slain an enemy in single combat may wear it.¹⁵ The Mekeo people have two special military ornaments, the *kefe* and the *iofo*, which only a man who has killed an enemy is permitted to wear. They are therefore insignia of which the wearers are very proud. They are conferred at special ceremonies lasting several days, to which friendly clans and villages are invited. "Hereditary spirit and pride in the wearing of these records of valour makes their owners wish to transmit them to their descendants, and this transmission is the subject of special ceremonies." Those who possess these insignia are entitled to take part in two ceremonies, in one of which the person recites his own act of daring, or if he has only inherited the right, the act of his ancestor. The other ceremony is a warlike parade, said to be very imposing. The possessors of these honorary decorations are much envied, and the greatest social distinction is awarded them.¹⁶

Painting the body is the chief mode of war decoration in Australia and the Pacific Islands. The Australians before battle paint the body hideously—red, black, and yellow being the usual colors. Sometimes feathers and leaves are worn. Besides being prompted by vanity, they also paint themselves in order to frighten the enemy.¹⁷ Painting the face is inseparable from warfare among the Fijians, whose favorite colors are lampblack and vermilion.¹⁸ The natives of Torres Straits paint their bodies red for the war dance as well as for actual conflict, and don ornamental anklets and leglets.¹⁹ The particular war ornament of the Timorese is a wooden comb decorated with feathers.²⁰ The warriors of Rotuma wear a flower-covered robe and a wooden or bamboo war hat ornamented with feathers. The body is smeared with turmeric and the soot of the *hifo* nut.²¹ The Samoans go to battle dressed "in their most valuable clothing and trinkets." They paint certain marks on the body by which they know their own party and which serve as a temporary watchword. "One day the distinguishing mark might be blackened cheeks; the next, two strokes on the breast; the next, a white shell suspended from a strip of white cloth round the neck, and so on."²²

The tribes of the New World painted and ornamented themselves for war in much the same manner as has been described. The Tlinkits, for example, when preparing for war, painted their face and powdered their hair a brilliant red. Then they ornamented their heads with white eagle feathers, "a token of stern, vindictive determination."²³ The natives of Nootka Sound thought red was the color which would most intimidate the enemy, and with this in mind they rubbed red ocher over their bodies.²⁴ The Columbians, on the contrary, blackened the whole

body in war; they also wore masks carved to represent an endless variety of monstrous faces, painted in bright colors, with mouth and eyes movable by strings, giving them a grotesquely ferocious aspect.²⁵ The buffalo robes of the Mandans were ornamented, on the flesh side of the skin, with pictured representations of the creditable events and battles of their lives. Their headdresses, now called "war-bonnets," were made of eagles' or ravens' quills and ermine. Occasionally a chief or warrior of extraordinary renown was allowed to wear horns on his headdress, which gave to his appearance a strange and majestic effect. Among the Eastern tribes, faces were variously painted for the warpath. The Shevuits of Arizona sometimes divided the face into three or four sections by different colors. Ordinarily the number of wounds received in battle was recorded by streaks of vermilion.²⁶ Black was the favorite color for war paint among the aborigines of Yucatan.²⁷ The Araucanians of Chile painted their faces to strike terror into the hearts of their enemies.²⁸

APPENDIX J

TROPHIES AND MUTILATION OF THE SLAIN

THE natives of Northeast Africa are proud of the wounds they receive in war and of the trophies they take. They practice extreme cruelty on their opponents, even tearing off the skin of the back and hacking off the hands while the enemy is still alive. As soon as the Danakil has overcome his opponent he cries with loud acclamation, "I have killed an enemy!" The first business of the victor is to take a trophy. Among the Somalis, Gallas, and Danakil, as among the Bantu and Kaffirs, the special trophy consists of the private parts of the slain. The victor hangs these on his horse's neck or on the wall or door of his house. Some Gallas are even to be seen in the streets of Harar strutting about with the pudenda of slain enemies tied on the forehead. One Galla hero had five hundred and twenty of these trophies. So great is the passionate longing of the Oromó for such marks of victory that they will take them from living slaves, merely to be able to make a fine showing.¹

Mutilation of the dead, among the Bahima, consists likewise in cutting off the male organs. In this case it is done chiefly to strike terror into the enemy's heart, and the parts cut off are thrown by the side of the corpse.² The South African tribes mutilate slain enemies for religious reasons. "Certain tribes deem it necessary to rip up the abdomen of the fallen. If this is not done they may suffer harm. When decomposition sets in and the body becomes distended with gas, the magicians belonging to the tribe of the slain are able to work witchery and bring defeat by means of this gas confined in the bodies of the dead."³ The Baganda likewise mutilate the bodies of enemies for superstitious reasons. "If the enemy is very powerful and they fear defeat, one or two of the fallen foe are secured, cut up and boiled; the flesh and the water are placed, if possible, where the enemy's food supply is; they consider it will kill anyone who eats this food." When they are returning home, to prevent evil following them, they cut up one or two bodies, gouge out the eyes, cut off the ears and place the limbs in the roads they are taking.⁴ The Bakongo, too, mutilate for similar motives, believing that the spirit of a slaughtered man, if his head is cut off, will haunt, and by witchcraft kill, the members of his own family. Therefore, they fight to preserve the body intact so that the vengeance of the spirit may not

fall on them as a family. On the other hand, they strive to mutilate the enemy's body so that *his* family may be done to death by the spirit owning the headless corpse.⁵

Mutilation in Africa is more frequently done in order to obtain trophies and arises from vanity more often than from religion. Thus if a native Batoka wished to curry favor with his chief, "he ascertained when a stranger was about to leave, and waylaid him at a distance from the town, and when he brought the head back to the chief, it was mounted as a trophy; the different chiefs vieing with each other as to which should mount the greatest number of skulls in his village."⁶ The Ba-Huana decapitate the fallen foe and preserve the skull as a trophy.⁷ When a man among the Bangala kills his opponent in a fight, "he cuts off the head and removes the lips, which he thoroughly dries in the sun, and then sticks in brass chair nails and wears them as an ornament with as much pride as the Victoria Cross is worn—it is the man's medal for bravery."⁸ The Boloki have the same practice.⁹ The Ashanti army may not return home without trophies. If the enemy have been slain, their jawbones are cut out, dried, and smoked; if the army has been worsted, the jawbones of those sacrificed before battle in propitiation of the gods are used as trophies instead. "The jawbones, packed in loads, are transported to the capital by prisoners of war; the heads of any hostile chiefs who may have fallen being preserved entire and carried separately."¹⁰ The Dahomans take heads as trophies and frequently place them on the palace walls. The military spirit is strongly cultivated in both male and female corps of the standing army of Dahomey, and "their chief aim in battle is to carry off a large number of trophies of their prowess, in the shape of prisoners, human heads and jawbones."¹¹

In Kafiristan the ears of slain enemies are cut off as trophies, among the Papuans of New Guinea the nose, while among the head-hunting tribes of India and the South Sea Islands the head or skull is also a trophy.¹² The desire for trophies among the tribes in New Guinea is a constant cause of war, for the victor is lauded as a hero and receives great reward. The Fijians mutilated their slain foes in a terrible way, for the most part in propitiation of the war god, but appear not to have taken trophies.¹³ In ordinary engagements, among the tribes of Torres Straits, each man would practically have but one enemy to encounter, and the victory belonged to him alone. The skull of the fallen foe was preserved as a proof of his success. The men of Tud "often used to make a raid on another island in order that their young men might have trophies, and so find favor with the women. Such raids were, as often as not, made upon weak islands, and not necessarily against those people

with whom there was any enmity or ill-feeling."¹⁴ The Murray Islanders also took the head as a trophy.¹⁵

The Australians, who are not very warlike, seldom mutilated their slain enemies, though sometimes they cut off the beard.¹⁶ The Tasmanians were more vindictive; their vengeance was not appeased by the death of an enemy, for the mutilation of the body, and particularly of the head, always followed.¹⁷ The bloodthirsty Maoris preserved the heads of their enemies as trophies, generally putting them on the palisades of forts, the tops of houses, or on poles by the wayside. They mocked and taunted them. As the greatest indignity, the skull was sometimes used as a container for food, or as a canoe bailer. The thigh bones were made into flutes, and the teeth into necklaces. They also took scalps to shake in the dance celebrating victory, while the mats on which great chiefs sat were made of the scalps of slain foes.¹⁸

Although scalping was the usual method of treating the slain enemy in both Americas, other trophies, notably the head, were taken. The Puget Sound Indians, for one, cut off the heads of the slaughtered foe and stuck them on poles in front of their dwellings, as a common way of demonstrating their joy over a victory. The Haidahs also took the head as a trophy instead of scalping, and while the latter custom was practiced in some localities in California the more usual trophies were the hands, feet, or head. They also plucked out and carefully preserved the eyes of the slain.¹⁹ The Osage were the only tribe of the plains which beheaded instead of scalping.²⁰ The wild tribes of Mexico practiced both methods. When the warriors decapitated the slain, they placed the heads on poles and paraded through the villages in token of victory, the inhabitants meanwhile dancing round them.²¹ With the above exceptions, and including also the Eskimos, scalping prevailed Mexico, and in parts of South America.²² A discussion of the reasons over the whole continent north of Mexico, among the wild tribes of for scalping is given in the text.

APPENDIX K

THE REGULATIVE SYSTEM OF PRIMITIVE SOCIETY

THE Bushmen of South Africa possess an extremely undeveloped regulative system. They have no definite clan or tribal organization, nor any societal structure of coherence or lasting qualities. An assemblage of families sometimes appoints its most respected member as headman, but he has no real power. There is no development beyond this, and there are no social classes.¹ Among the Hottentots, each kraal has a chief, whose office is sometimes temporary, sometimes hereditary, but he exercises scarcely any authority in time of peace. The Hottentots have no social hierarchy, aristocracy, or slavery, though wealth, which is reckoned in cattle, gives a man great social influence.² The chief of the Bechuana has powers which are in the main those of the medicine man.³

The chief is the superior power in Azimba and Chipitaland, yet his headmen and people form a sort of jury, and the chief dares not act against their verdict. The chief's power depends upon the inclination of the people—if they like him, they obey him; if not, he is left alone.⁴ The same condition prevails among the Achipeta. "The chiefs have no real hold over the people, and hence the people are not accustomed to obey orders. They generally take the line of least resistance; they will readily assent to anything they are told and not do it."⁵ In British Central Africa the chiefs and headmen have scant power beyond hearing disputes,⁶ and the same general form of government prevails in East Central Africa.⁷

Among the Kikuyu,⁸ the Wagogo,⁹ and Nyole¹⁰ tribes of East Africa the same person is chief and priest. The Atharaka are essentially democratic. Each district has an elder, who meets with the other elders on occasions to hear disputes and give judgment. Chiefs are nonexistent, but there is in every community a man whose influence is predominant; generally there are two, one a civil leader and the other a war chief.¹¹ Among the Akamba, the expression, "he is not my father," is often heard in reference to a chief; this implies that the speaker is not obliged to acknowledge him or heed his orders. The administration of law rests with a council of elders. The Akamba have practically no

recognized chiefs but rather leaders, who in time of war possess great power.¹² The Wa-Sania have a hereditary chieftainship and a council of elders to assist.¹³ In Kavirondo and Nandi, the chief is simply the head of a clan or sub-tribe which takes its name from him.¹⁴ Each Jalou village represents a family, the father of which is the headman of the village. The various village heads constitute a council. The whole tribe is under a chief, but he has very little power, the council being the most important part of the regulative system.¹⁵ The Suk-Nandi tribes are governed by petty chiefs of no real power; coördinated effort among the tribes is lacking.¹⁶

The system of government found among the Ba-Mbala is extremely elementary; it has been described as "communism with a strong flavouring of anarchy." The unit is the village community, at the head of which is a chief, called Tata or father, who holds his position by reason of his wealth in slaves and wives. On his death the power devolves upon the next richest individual; there is no form of election. Although slavery exists, it is little more than nominal, the difference between slave and freeman being very slight. The administration of justice may be summed up in the single word "palaver," which is a form of trial. There is no judge; the decision is left to the crowd.¹⁷ The Ba-Huana are governed by petty chiefs whose office is hereditary. There are certain villages where the chief has died without heir, and in these cases the villagers live in a state of no-government, but seem nevertheless to agree very well. The chief's principal function is the administration of justice; most of the power lies in the hands of a council composed of all the free adult males of the village.¹⁸

The natives of the Congo region are divided into clans, tribes, and small communities under the nominal government of chiefs and headmen. Hereditary chieftainship seldom exists.¹⁹ In the Belgian Congo the power of the headman or chief is greatly curtailed by a council. The office is not necessarily hereditary, though a chief may name as successor one of his sons who is renowned for his prowess. There is no variation in rank among the people.²⁰ Chiefs among the Bangala of the Upper Congo River are simply headmen, i.e., heads of families. Each family head has power over his own group, while the heads of all the families meet together to talk over town affairs and to decide on any general course of action. Some are heads of larger families or are richer than others, and therefore have more influence. Each village is self-governing, and the administration of justice is by palaver.²¹ Every Bageshu village has its elder who tries petty cases in his own community, while more serious cases are adjudicated by the chief of the clan.

The chiefs exercise little or no power over the people; theirs is only a nominal chieftainship.²² The Pygmies have no settled government, but merely cluster round an able hunter or cunning fighter whom they accept as lawgiver for the time.²³ The chief among the Fang is also the headman, and is hardly distinguishable from the rest of the people.²⁴

Among the Jekris, Sobos, and Ijos of the Niger Coast Protectorate, the head of a village is generally either an old man or the one who has the most worldly goods.²⁵ The Nigerian head-hunters choose a war leader before war commences, but in time of peace are governed by chiefs who have almost no power.²⁶ The Asaba have three grades of chiefs based entirely on wealth. The payments required of a candidate for chieftainship of the first class are often sufficient to impoverish him.²⁷ In all native communities of the Niger Delta a man cannot become a full chief unless he has decapitated at least one enemy in war or a prisoner in cold blood. "Failing either of these actions, he must on the occasion of his being made a chief, purchase a slave for the express purpose, and woe betide him if by any chance he should bungle in his task and not take the victim's head off in a workmanlike manner. . . . Cases have occurred of powerful chiefs making their young sons perform this horrible head-cutting rite before they were in their teens. These children can always be recognized by their being allowed to wear a large feather in their hats, this mark of distinction being strictly the sole right of a chief."²⁸

The Dinkas are a mere congeries of independent tribes. "Each village governs itself by means of the village elders, and the chief is merely the leader in petty raids."²⁹ The main function of Galla chiefs is leadership in war, and in this rests their power.³⁰

The Andamanese accord a certain preëminence to those who excel as hunters or fishermen, but they have no chiefs with any appreciable power.³¹ The peaceful Veddahs of Ceylon are very democratic, possess no social classes, and do not have an established government.³² Perhaps the most rudimentary government among the aborigines of India is that of the Todas, who are peaceful and are without military organization. Political headships are entirely lacking.³³ The Nagas, who are continually at war, have nevertheless only a slightly developed form of government. Each kin-group in a village community is independent and self-governing. The people are very democratic, "each man is said to be as good as his neighbour,"³⁴ and "every man is his own master, and avenges his own quarrel."³⁵ They have a chief or headman, but he is simply *primus inter pares*, and often that only for the time being.³⁶ The Kaupuis have a hereditary chief, but his influence rests on his wealth

or his reputation for deeds of daring. They also have a council, but its powers are slight; "each village is a sort of miniature republic."³⁷ The Kuki-Lushai clans are described as being very democratic, formerly living in small consanguineous communities under a patriarch or headman. "In some of these communities individuals by their skill in war and the chase came to the front and attracted members of other families to their hamlets and became the founders of lines of chiefs."³⁸ Generally the headman among the tribes of Assam has negligible authority.³⁹ The Afridis have neither a well-recognized head of the whole tribe nor a single village which is preëminent. "Every chief of a family is practically a law unto himself and to his family, if he is only strong enough to hold his own."⁴⁰ In Kafirstan wealth is the criterion of rank.⁴¹

Among the tribes of the Malay Peninsula, the chief is often the medicine man or magician.⁴² All the tribes in Selangor, Pahang, and other parts of Negri Sembilan as well as Sungei Ujong, have chiefs or headmen who to all intents and purposes wield no authority whatsoever. No actual discipline is enforced, and the people "live untrammelled by any self-made laws or rules."⁴³ The people at Kuala Kernam had "no system of chieftainship, nor did they look up to any single person as their head."⁴⁴

The Kubus of Sumatra, who lead a nomadic life, have a very rudimentary regulative system. What jurisdiction there is, is wielded by the elders of the party.⁴⁵ In Borneo, the chief is either the medicine man or the headman of a family or village, but in either case his power is merely one of persuasion and depends upon his personal ability.⁴⁶ No man in Timorlaut recognizes a superior; the head of the village, elected by general vote, holds only a nominal position.⁴⁷

The population of New Guinea is divided into independent tribes, each having its nominal chief but ruled in reality by a council of old men.⁴⁸ Among the Papuans, warlike ability, wisdom, experience, and alleged magical power give a man precedence over others, but lead to no hereditary office.⁴⁹ In British New Guinea chieftainship is often hereditary but carries little weight.⁵⁰ In the western tribe of Torres Straits, chieftainship is gained through age, wealth, wisdom, or prowess in war, but it gives no real authority; the people act according to their own desires. In time of war, however, the chiefs have some power, since they are then the leaders.⁵¹ The chief's position in the Admiralty Islands depends on his fighting qualities.⁵² There is "lack of all constituted authority among the people" of New Britain.⁵³ The Solomon Islanders have no established government. "If a man is married and has got a little

money and a few slaves, he calls himself a chief, but does not exercise any power over his slaves; they do pretty well as they like. They recognise one or two as the head chiefs in a village, but do not listen to them unless in a fight."⁵⁴ In New Georgia the chief leads in war, but "the only men he can compel to follow him are his slaves; the others come if they wish it."⁵⁵ Chieftainship in the New Hebrides is procured by giving pigs for a public feast. Even small boys may be chiefs. Chiefs lack both authority and prestige.⁵⁶ In Fiji the chief has but little power.⁵⁷

There is practically no government among the aborigines of Australia. Each family has its head who settles disputes which arise between members of the household, and there is a council of elders. There is no real chieftainship nor is there anyone possessing authority over the tribe. Personal ability meets with some ascendancy, however, (age, warlike prowess, and supposed magical power being the chief attributes) yet there are no social classes and the people are on a basis of virtual equality.⁵⁸ Like the Australians, the Tasmanians were grouped in communal clans with some individuals raised above the others by personal merit.⁵⁹

The Maoris of New Zealand, until they conquered other tribes, had a most simple form of government. They were essentially democratic, each tribe managing its own affairs. There were two chiefs: one, a war chief, who was elected to office; the other, a priest chief or Ariki, whose office was hereditary. The latter had more power, save in time of war.⁶⁰ The government of Savage Island seems to have always been democratic. The fighting men wielded most power and elected the chief, but the priests also had considerable political influence.⁶¹ In Bowditch Island the chief is elected by the whole body of the people.⁶² In Rotuma there are district chiefs assisted by councils, and also spiritual chiefs who appear to possess more power.⁶³

The Yakuts lived in a sort of communism in which age and wealth were accorded rank. The headship of the community was a dignity exclusively for war and the administration of justice. The elected government was merely nominal, all questions being decided by a council of elders.⁶⁴ The peaceful Eskimos have no government worthy of the name. The Greenlanders have been forced to combine, not because of the competition of life, but rather as a result of their inhospitable natural surroundings.⁶⁵ Generally the Eskimos are organized into small free communities in which an able hunter or an old man sometimes gains a little ascendancy. Slavery is unknown and as a rule no social distinctions exist.⁶⁶

The American Indians had, in general, an undeveloped regulative system. The Ten'a had no chiefs; the medicine man was the only person of authority in the tribe.⁶⁷ Among the tribes of British Columbia, age and wealth conferred prestige, but the people were generally free to manage their own affairs. The chief was the father rather than the ruler of the tribe. His influence depended on his personal qualities, and unless he were the most noted warrior he could not direct the military operations.⁶⁸ Among the inland Columbians no real authority was exercised except by the war chief, and then only when on the warpath.⁶⁹ The Californians had no form of government in time of peace; in time of war they obeyed their bravest warriors.⁷⁰ The Dakotas,⁷¹ the Navajos, and Iroquois⁷² had no tribal chiefs. Many tribes had a sachem or peace chief and, in times of war, a war chief. Usually the people as a whole declared war, and the war parties were composed wholly of volunteers. Neither sachem nor war chief had much power.⁷³

Among the Bororo Indians in South America, chieftainship depended on singing ability.⁷⁴ The Guaranis had no headship in time of peace; in war they followed the ablest warrior.⁷⁵ The Lengua natives had so-called chiefs, but a better name for them would be "father of the family." The chiefs were lacking in power; the people regulated their lives almost exclusively by public opinion.⁷⁶ The Abipones were divided into hordes, each ruled by a chief who had little authority except in time of war.⁷⁷ The basis of the social and political life of the Araucanians was the family; the head of the family governed the clan, and the chief ruled over the tribe. "There was no political organisation as we understand the term, and the Araucanos recognised no supreme chief, save only in times of great national peril, and then only in a military sense, and by public election. The danger over, they returned to their former customs, the functions of the chief ceasing from the moment the army was disbanded."⁷⁸ The Patagonians and all the nomadic tribes of the pampas had only the simplest form of government. Before undertaking an expedition they deliberated in council and chose a leader. Obedience to him was the only limitation on personal freedom.⁷⁹ Among the Fuegians, who were grouped in small hordes, there was to all intents and purposes no form of government whatever, though the word of the old men was accepted as law by the younger people. There existed no social differentiation save the superiority acquired by age, sagacity, or daring conduct.⁸⁰

Among more advanced peoples, the Iranians were organized on the patriarchal system, the head of the family being the chief, and the district heads leading in war.⁸¹ Among the Aryan-speaking peoples the

earliest forms of government were likewise based on the organization of the family.⁸² In the present-day East European house communities may be seen political power in the embryo, the chief developing from the head of the household. The old men are influential, but in time of war, the foremost warrior has authority.⁸³ The Germans at the time of Tacitus, like the American Indians, had a peace chief and a war chief.⁸⁴ In modern as in ancient Arabia, except in time of war, "the license of individual freewill is absolutely uncontrolled."⁸⁵ The Bedouins and other Arabs today are a free nation; "the liberty and independence of individuals among them almost border upon anarchy." Every tribe has its sheikh, but the sheikh has no actual authority over the individuals of his tribe; he endeavors to maintain his position by the means which wealth, talents, courage, etc., afford.⁸⁶ The Berbers are quite as independent and democratic,⁸⁷ while the Turkomans are said to be still without government and to live upon a footing of virtual equality.⁸⁸

APPENDIX L

THE DECLARATION OF WAR

THE effect of a declaration of war as it occurs among the Inland Negroes and the Ba-Mbala is to render the encounter less severe, so much so that a special name, *Kutana* or small war, is given by the latter people to this kind of warfare. A day and place are appointed for the battle, the bush is cleared to give a fair and open field, and the kind of weapons and mode of fighting so regulated that rarely are any of the combatants killed. Should one or more by any chance be killed, *Gembi* or real war ensues, in which no declaration is made, no quarter is given to the wounded, and every form of treachery is employed.¹ The Gallas sometimes notify their opponents of their intention to attack.² The Bangala attempt to make an attack secret, but "there are always friends and relatives who will inform their friends and relatives on the other side," so that while no formal declaration of war takes place the enemy is always forewarned.³ The same situation prevails among the Nigerian head-hunters, where the women or other people of a town friendly to both sides usually pass the word along. The Gannawarri have what the Hausa call a "knife sharpening," a delay of about three days between the quarrel and the attack, which gives the enemy warning and time to prepare.⁴ Among the Kaffirs the act is more avowed. They consider it shameful to attack their enemy without a declaration of war.⁵ In Eastern Equatorial Africa the declaration of war is after the manner of diplomacy. "When a chief wishes to declare war he sends to the chief against whom he has a complaint an ambassador bearing a leaden bullet and a hoe. If the latter chooses the bullet, war ensues; if the hoe, it means that he consents to enter into negotiations to maintain peace."⁶ In South Africa the declaration of war takes a peculiar form. Among these tribes the hair is so worn as to indicate the tribe to which a man belongs; and "a royal messenger sent home with his hair cut is equivalent to a declaration of war."⁷

Among the Manipuri Angámi, "the custom was not infrequent of giving warning to the opposite village before the attack, but without naming the time."⁸ The evils of blood feud were lessened by the Luhupa custom of giving notice to the village about to be proceeded against, and by the Angámi method of intimating to a village that its members after a

specified day would be killed whenever an opportunity was presented. A group of Nagas in full war dress once approached a British camp and issued a challenge to fight.⁹ Captain Butler¹⁰ mentions the following instances of the Nagas' expressive manner of emphasizing messages: "I remember a challenge being conveyed by means of a piece of charred wood, a chilli, and a bullet tied together. This declaration of war was handed on from village to village, until it reached the one for which it was intended, where it was no sooner read than it was at once despatched to me by a special messenger, who in turn brought with him a spear, a cloth, a fowl, and some eggs, the latter articles signifying their subordination and friendship to me, at whose hands they now begged for protection. It is, perhaps, scarcely necessary for me to explain that the piece of burnt wood signified the nature of the punishment threatened (i.e., a village consumed to flames), the bullet descriptive of the kind of weapon with which the foe was coming armed, and the chilli the smarting, stinging, and general painful nature of the punishment. And one day a piece of wood, with a twisted bark collar at one end and a rope at the other, used for tying up dogs on the line of march, was brought to me with another prayer for protection. The explanation in this case is of course obvious, viz., that a dog's treatment was in store for the unfortunate recipients of this truculent message."

The Malays have a similar way of declaring war, which Frobenius¹¹ has called "a legal demand bound with a threat." Thus the Battaks, before taking up arms, announce the war by a cartel. "The cartel consists of a piece of bamboo a span long, on which are written the grievances and the declaration of war, a bundle of straw and a bamboo knife, to denote fire-raising and throat-cutting, and a spear-head of carved bamboo; the whole being tied up in a bundle and hung up at night where the enemy will see it."¹² Among the Ilongotes war is signified by a bundle of arrows or the sprinkling of the road with blood.¹³ When the Li-su of Tibeto-China intend to rebel, they send to the Moso chief, who rules them on behalf of the Chinese government, a stick with knife-cut notches. "Some symbols are fastened to it, such, for instance, as a feather, calcined wood, a little fish, etc. The bearer must explain the meaning of the notches and symbols. The notches may indicate the number of hundreds or thousands of soldiers who are coming; the feather shows that they arrive with the swiftness of a bird; the burnt wood, that they will set fire to everything on their way; the fish, that they will throw everything into the water, etc. This custom is largely used among all the savage tribes of the region. It is also the usual manner in which chiefs transmit their orders."¹⁴

It was customary in parts of Oceania to declare war. It sometimes happened at Hood Point, New Guinea, that one tribe would challenge another and a place of meeting would be arranged. Such fights were always less serious than those in which no notice was given.¹⁵ In Dutch New Guinea a huge fire kept burning for a long time meant a declaration of war,¹⁶ and among the people of Torres Straits a fire was lighted as a challenge and another in reply to it. Although these latter people gave timely notice prior to an aggression, yet the most profound secrecy was afterward maintained by the invaders and every means of treachery was employed.¹⁷ Among the Papuans a broken spear served as a formal declaration of war.¹⁸ There were a few instances of notification prior to attack among the Fijians, but "usually the declaration of war took place in a more practical fashion by the surprise and slaughter of an unarmed party of the enemy—women fishing on the reef, or a messenger returning home in his canoe."¹⁹ In Rotuma, "it was not uncommon for the chief of the one side to send to the chief of the other a definite challenge for a particular day and place."²⁰ Among the Samoans and Tongans a broken mooring stick constituted a declaration of war.²¹ Fierce warriors as were the Maoris, "they often exhibited courtly generosity that was almost chivalrous. When a fort was attacked it was not unusual for a message to be sent through some neutral person warning the defenders to get ready. It was only in cases of bitter blood-feud that surprises were undertaken, or if the attacking force was much inferior in number to the other side."²²

Challenging and declaring war are quite customary in Australia, and messengers who convey the information are attached to every tribe.²³ In Victoria, for instance, "if one tribe intends to attack another, due notice is always honourably given."²⁴ Before the fighting men of the Won-Komarra tribe set out to avenge an injury of any sort, "a herald is despatched to the enemy to declare war, and his life is held sacred."²⁵ In some parts of Australia the natives sent by a tribe to convey a challenge carry with them spears which are decorated with the feathers of the emu.²⁶ When the Kaiabara tribe has a dispute with another tribe, it sends a challenge by a messenger "who carries a piece of wood cut in the form of a boomerang, with a shell tied at one end. If the other tribe keeps the stick and the shell, the challenge is accepted, and they send back word by the messenger naming the place and time for the meeting; but if they consider themselves not strong enough and are afraid, they keep the shell and send back the stick. This means that they decline the challenge. They have to break the shell on a stone in the presence of

the messenger as a sign that they acknowledge themselves to be beaten."²⁷

The aborigines of North America frequently declared war, often using for the purpose a blood-red war hatchet or a bundle of arrows wrapped in rattlesnake skin.²⁸ War was declared by the council, and if any party went out without the council's authority, its members were all severely whipped.²⁹ The Canadian Algonquian Indians declared war by sending to the enemy a slave of the same nation with an ax, the handle of which was painted red and black. The Huron-Iroquois of Canada sent a belt of black wampum as a declaration of war. The Natchez made announcement of their hostile intentions by leaving against a tree in the enemy's country a hieroglyphic picture in front of which they placed two red arrows. The picture showed the nation which was declaring war, when they would come, etc.³⁰ When the Indian tribes of the lower Mississippi Valley wished to declare war, they held a council of war. At the door of the dwelling in which they met, they planted a pole attached to which was a calumet of war. Notice was given to the enemy by a tablet on which were many figures announcing "that when such a moon shall be so many days old they will come in great numbers to attack such a nation."³¹ Arrows with long hairs attached were stuck up along the trail or road by the Florida Indians to signify a declaration of war.³² Among the Central Californians challenging by heralds obtained. "Thus the Shumeias challenge the Pomos by placing three little sticks, notched in the middle and at both ends, on a mount which marks the boundary between the two tribes. If the Pomos accept, they tie a string round the middle notch. Heralds then meet and arrange time and place, and the battle comes off as appointed."³³

In Honduras the enemy was often challenged to pitched battle.³⁴ The Chibchas sent messengers to announce war.³⁵ The Peruvians always notified the enemy beforehand of their attack.³⁶ The rulers of Mexico commonly endeavored to justify their conduct before they made war and never commenced hostilities without sending due notice of their intention to the adversary. It was a breach of international etiquette to proceed to war without giving due notice to the enemy. "It was usual to send a formal challenge or declaration of war, accompanied by some presents, either of arms, clothing, or food, as it was held to be a discreditable act to attack any unarmed or defenceless people." In North Mexico the day fixed for the battle was sometimes announced to the enemy, and a spot on which the fight was to take place was selected.³⁷ Although "the Aztecs believed it cowardly and unworthy of valiant men to surprise an enemy, nevertheless they sent spies among them, in order

that they might give an account of the number, the efficiency, and the movements of their troops."³⁸ Something approaching a declaration of war was made by the Hebrews on rare occasions.³⁹ Occasionally a Bedouin sheikh who sees that his people are not satisfied with the terms of peace will send a written or verbal notification to the other party that hostilities must be renewed, but this also is not very common.⁴⁰

APPENDIX M

TORTURE OF PRISONERS OF WAR

THE American aborigines who did not hold slaves or adopt their prisoners of war were notorious for the cruel tortures to which they subjected their captured enemies. When the Koniagas or Southern Eskimos took male prisoners of war, they either killed them immediately or reserved them "to torture for the edification and improvement of their children."¹ It was a favorite practice of the victorious Okanagans of British Columbia "to drive the defeated Shuswaps into their kee-kee-lee houses and then throw down fire-brands into the midst of them, killing those who tried to escape death by the flames."² Bancroft³ writes as follows of the cruelties inflicted on prisoners by the inland Columbians: "The dead having been scalped, and prisoners bound and taken up behind the victors, the party starts homeward. Torture of the prisoners, chiefly perpetrated by the women, follows the arrival. By the Flatheads and northern nations captives are generally killed by their sufferings; among the Sahaptins some survive and are made slaves. In the Flathead torture of the Blackfeet are practiced all the fiendish acts of cruelty that native cunning can devise, all of which are borne with the traditional stoicism and taunts of the North American Indian. The Nez Percé system is a little less cruel in order to save life for future slavery. Day after day, at a stated hour, the captives are brought out and made to hold the scalps of their dead friends aloft on poles while the scalp-dance is performed about them, the female participators meanwhile exerting all their devilish ingenuity in tormenting their victims." Prisoners of war are killed with great tortures by the Shoshones, "especially female captives, who are given over to the women of the victorious tribe and by them done to death most cruelly." Among the natives of Los Angeles County "all prisoners of war, after being tortured in the most cruel manner, are invariably put to death." When some of the upper Dakotas had taken a prisoner, they tied him to a stake and mutilated him before killing him. Wounded enemies who fell into their hands were slain and their bodies, after being cut into pieces, were thrown toward the retreating foes.⁴ The Apaches delight in torturing; they regard chivalry as "sheer folly and useless risk of life."⁵ "They treat their prisoners cruelly; scalping them, or burning them at the stake."⁶ The Comanches regularly killed their male cap-

tives; the Pimas crucified them or otherwise put them to death with great infliction of pain.⁷ The Natchez burned their war captives, while other tribes of the lower Mississippi Valley put the male prisoners on frames where they immolated the victims.⁸

When prisoners are taken by the tribes of North Mexico, "they are handed to the women for torture, who treat them most inhumanly, heaping upon them every insult devisable, besides searing their flesh with burning brands, and finally burning them at the stake, or sacrificing them in some equally cruel manner. Many cook and eat the flesh of their captives, reserving the bones as trophies." Among the wild tribes of the valley of Mexico, "prisoners were treated with the utmost barbarity, ending invariably in the death of the unfortunates; often they were scalped while yet alive, and the bloody trophy placed upon the heads of their tormentors."⁹ The Guaranis of Brazil massacred their prisoners ruthlessly and afterward ate them. "The victim would appear brave and boastful before his torturer; he would sing his war song, and remind his enemy how many of their prisoners his own tribe had eaten when they had been victorious."¹⁰ After a successful campaign, "the Coroados are accustomed to pierce with arrows the limbs of their enemies, the Puris, when any of them fall into their power, and to pass them from hand to hand at their drinking feasts to suck them."¹¹

In Africa, war captives are often tortured, killed, or allowed to starve to death.¹² Among the Tshi-speaking peoples,¹³ "prisoners of war are treated with shocking barbarity. Men, women, and children—mothers with infants on their backs and little children scarcely able to walk—are stripped and secured together with cords round the neck in gangs of ten or fifteen; each prisoner being additionally secured by having the hands fixed to a heavy block of wood, which has to be carried on the head. Thus hampered, and so insufficiently fed that they are reduced to mere skeletons, they are driven after the victorious army for month after month, their brutal guards treating them with the greatest cruelty; while, should their captors suffer a reverse, they are at once indiscriminately slaughtered to prevent recapture. Ramseyer and Kühne mention the case of a prisoner, a native of Accra, who was 'kept in log,' that is, secured to the felled trunk of a tree by an iron staple driven over the wrist, with insufficient food for four months, and who died under this ill-treatment. Another time they saw amongst some prisoners a poor, weak child, who, when angrily ordered to stand upright, 'painfully drew himself up, showing the sunken frame in which every bone was visible.' Most of the prisoners seen on this occasion were mere living skeletons. One boy was so reduced by starvation, that

his neck was unable to support the weight of his head, which, as he sat, drooped almost to his knees. Another equally emaciated, coughed as if at the last gasp; while a young child was so weak from want of food as to be unable to stand. The Ashantis were much surprised that the missionaries should exhibit any emotion at such spectacles; and, on one occasion when they went to give food to some starving children, the guards angrily drove them back." Both the regular army and the levies in Dahomey show an equal callousness to human suffering. "Wounded prisoners are denied all assistance, and all prisoners who are not destined to slavery are kept in a condition of semi-starvation that speedily reduces them to mere skeletons. . . . The lower jawbone is much prized as a trophy . . . and it is very frequently torn from the wounded and living foe."¹⁴

When the Timorese capture an enemy, "they become perfect demons and execute the most horrible cruelty on their still living victim, before affixing his quarters on their public places."¹⁵ The Papuans of New Guinea,¹⁶ the Trings of Sarawak,¹⁷ the Nicobarese,¹⁸ and others¹⁹ torture their prisoners, often killing them by this means. The scenes that followed the sack of a fortress in Fiji "are too horrible to be described in detail. That neither age nor sex was spared was the least atrocious feature. Nameless mutilations, inflicted sometimes on living victims, deeds of mingled cruelty and lust, made self-destruction preferable to capture. With the fatalism that underlies the Melanesian character many would not attempt to run away, but would bow their heads passively to the club-stroke. If any were miserable enough to be taken alive their fate was awful indeed. Carried back bound to the chief village, they were given up to young boys of rank to practice their ingenuity in torture, or, stunned by a blow they were laid in heated ovens, that when the heat brought them back to consciousness of pain, their frantic struggles might convulse the spectators with laughter. Children were strung up to the masthead by the feet, that the rolling of the canoe might dash out their brains against the mast."²⁰ In Samoa, prisoners, if men, were generally killed. "In a battle which was fought in 1830 a fire was kindled and many of the prisoners burned."²¹ Many other Polynesian tribes killed their wounded enemies and tortured their captives to death. The nomadic Mongolians are said to slaughter their prisoners without any distinction as to age or sex.²² The Romans derived keen satisfaction in watching their war captives slay and be slain in the arena.²³

REFERENCES TO CHAPTERS

CHAPTER I

1. See Tylor, *Early History of Mankind*, Chap. XI; *Primitive Culture*, I, Chaps. VIII, IX, X; and *Anthropology*, Chap. XV, for a full discussion of the historical value of mythology.
2. *Anthropology*, p. 877.
3. Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology*, p. 6. See his first four chapters for a good discussion of the field of ethnology.
4. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, p. 823.
5. See Spencer, *The Study of Sociology*.
6. *Man and Culture*, p. 4.
7. *Antiquity of Man*, Chap. XIX, p. 379.
8. *Primitive Culture*, II, 102 ff.
9. *British Assn. Rept., Dundee Meeting, 1867*, Pt. II, Notices and Abstracts, pp. 121 ff.
10. Cf. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 322-323.
11. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 32. See also his excellent chapter (III) on "The Continuity of Culture."
12. *Early Civilization*, p. 327.
13. *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 22.
14. *Principles of Sociology*, I, 384.
15. Keith, *Antiquity of Man*, p. 510. Lubbock has given the terms paleolithic, old or unpolished stone, and neolithic, new or polished stone, to the two chief industries of prehistoric man. Recently more ancient artifacts have been discovered, to which J. Allen Brown has given the name eoliths, which indicate that man lived in Tertiary times. For a discussion of the eolithic problem, see MacCurdy, "Some phases of Prehistoric Archeology," in *Proceedings Amer. Assn. Adv. Sci.*, XVI, 2-13; "The Eolithic Problem," in *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., VII, No. 3; *Human Origins*, I, Chap. III.
16. For a discussion of the antiquity of man, see Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, Chap. XII; Darwin, *The Descent of Man*; Tylor, *Anthropology*, Chap. I; Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*, Chap. II; Geikie, *Antiquity of Man in Europe*, pp. 3-4. For an excellent discussion of paleolithic art, see MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, I, 207-283; for fossil man, I, 294-425.
17. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 221.
18. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 3; Tylor, *Anthropology*, pp. 183 ff.; and Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 280 ff., all trace the evolution of weapons from the stick and the stone.
19. Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 578.
20. Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, pp. 111-112.
21. For some instances see the following: Roth, "Aborig. of Hispaniola," *JAI*, XVI, 268; Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 190; Philippi, "Easter Island," *JAI*, V, 111; Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 471-472; Lawes, "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 373; Haddon, "Stone Clubs," *JAI*, XXX,

- 242; Crump, "Trephining in the South Seas," *JAI*, XXXI, 167; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 35; Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 330.
22. After flint, the most utilized stones are serpentine and serpentine granite, hornblende, argillite, basalt, chalcedony, and jasper. Many of the stone weapons of the New World were of obsidian. Cf. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, I, 4; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 8.
23. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, pp. 155-168. Cf. Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, I, 61 ff., 77, 84, 105, 163, 222, 322, 487, 535; De Mortillet, *Le Préhistorique*, pp. 206-207, 226; MacCurdy, "La Combe," in *Amer. Anth.*, XVI, No. 2, 166; MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 139 ff.
24. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, pp. 167, 411, 413.
25. Kroeber, *Anthropology*, p. 168.
26. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 184. For instances of advanced peoples who used or still use the war club, see Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 3, 51, 54, 58, 60-65; Boscawen, "Prehistoric Civilisation of Babylonia," *JAI*, VIII, 36; Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, pp. 444 ff.; Brinton, *Ethnography* I, P. III, p. 256; Schrader, *Aryan Peoples*, Pt. III, Chap. X; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 408 ff.; Burckhardt, *Bedouins*, p. 31.
27. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 38; Kroeber, *Anthropology*, pp. 410-413; Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, I, 10-11, 268, 297, 311.
28. Keller, *Lake Dwellings of Switzerland*, *passim*.
29. Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 410.
30. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 7.
31. Schrader, *Aryan Peoples*, p. 238.
32. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 33; Tylor, "Tasmanians," *JAI*, XXIII, 141-152; Griesbach, "Weapons of South Africa," *JAI*, I, cliv; Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 6; Stow, *Native Races of South Africa*, pp. 62 ff.; Gooch, "The Stone Age of South Africa," *JAI*, XI, 124-183.
33. Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, p. 371; cf. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 22.
34. Keller, *Lake Dwellings of Switzerland*. This is a classical authority on the subject. Cf. MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 67-75.
35. Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, pp. 371; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 22-23; MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, I, 13-15.
36. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 22-23, 42-43; Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 224; "Annual Report of 1890, British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXI, 201; Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 58; Semon, *Im australischen Busch*, pp. 371-372.
37. *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 28-29.
38. "Handbook American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. I, p. 470.
39. Cf. Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, p. 370.
40. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 31.
41. "Danewerk und Hedeby," in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXVI, 683.
42. Gowland, "Dolmens and Other Antiquities of Korea," *JAI*, XXIV, 328.
43. *Aryan Peoples*, p. 150. Cf. *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 103 ff.
44. *Prehistoric Man*, pp. 235, 371.
45. *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 312-313 (quoted), 319, 572.
46. Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, I, 401, 487, 519, 608, 623; II, Pt. I, pp. 216-229; Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 409; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 12; Keller, *Lake Dwellings of Switzerland*, I, 123, 145,

- 236, 259, 264, 342, 348, 355, 386, 393, 594. For a general discussion, see MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 193 ff.
47. Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology*, pp. 59-60; Ogburn, *Social Change*, pp. 145 ff.
48. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 11, 12, 19.
49. *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, I, 404, 407, 463, 495, 519; II, Pt. I, p. 199 (quoted). See also Kroeber, *Anthropology*, p. 419.
50. Keller, *Lake Dwellings of Switzerland*, I, 147, 186, 275, 447, 467, 668; Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, II, Pt. I, pp. 199-214; Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 409.
51. In *Cambridge Ancient History*, pp. 108-109.
52. Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, II, Pt. I, pp. 215-216; Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 409.
53. *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, II, Pt. I, pp. 222-240.
54. *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 409.
55. *Human Origins*, II, 197.
56. Cf. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 25.
57. *Cambridge Ancient History*, pp. 109-110.
58. Keller, *Lake Dwellings of Switzerland*, I, 126, 283, 415, 417, 447, 462; Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, p. 409; Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, p. 377; MacCurdy, *Human Origins*, II, 232, 237, 240-241, 254-260.
59. Elliot, *Prehistoric Man*, Chap. XXVI.
60. *Aryan Peoples*, pp. 151-152.

CHAPTER II

1. *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, p. 14.
2. Cf. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 217 n., 234; Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 132.
3. "An Essay on the Principle of Population."
4. Reuter, *Population Problems*, pp. 66, 69, 106; Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 28, 197-199; Wright, *Population*, pp. 28-32; Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 31-32.
5. Keller, "Birth Control," *Yale Review*, VII, No. I, pp. 129-139; Reuter, *population Problems*, pp. 169, 171, ff.; Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 34-35; Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 318-319; Cox, *The Problem of Population*, pp. 115, 117, 203.
6. *Earth Hunger*, p. 286.
7. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 25. Cf. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 283-284, 344; "under a given culture the tribal group expands until it reaches the limit of its food supply; then if it does not succumb, or remain static, it evolves new mechanisms for feeding itself and then expands to a still higher limit, only to repeat the phenomenon once more."
8. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 31 ff.
9. *Folkways*, p. 18. Cf. Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, Pt. III, on social processes.
10. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 18.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 3, 111; Cf. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 278.

12. Culture has been defined by Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology*, pp. 16, 27, as "a complex of socially acquired traits," and by Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 49, as "the aggregate thoughts and deeds of the tribe."
13. Sumner, *War*, p. 9.
14. Frobenius, *Menchenjadgen und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 1-2, holds that war arises directly from the struggle for existence. Another general author, Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 7-8, gives a biological origin of war. In his usual manner, he first treats of war among the lower animals, where he says it is caused by the struggle for existence. Man, however, he asserts, is not a slave to these natural forces, and war among men is not necessary (pp. 543 ff.) and can be abolished (pp. 554 ff.). Gumpłowicz, in *Der Rassenkampf* has given a fine treatment of race struggle, but he bases it on the theory of polygenism, which is not necessary nor fundamental. His general thesis can be made applicable by adding to it the ratio of population to land as the fundamental cause of race struggle. Sumner, *War*, p. 10, thought that war would always exist; "it is in the conditions of human existence."
15. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 283.
16. *Anthropology*, p. 413.
17. *Australian Race*, I, 64, 85. Cf. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *JAI*, XLIII, 146. He says of the Kariera: "It is impossible for a man to leave his local group and become naturalized or adopted in another. Just as the country belonged to him, so he belonged to it. If he left it he became a stranger, either the guest or the enemy of the men in whose country he found himself."
18. "Duk Duk, etc.," *JAI*, XXVII, 181-182.
19. "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 103.
20. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
21. "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 485.
22. Tate, "Notes on the Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 131-132; Steere, "East African Tribes," *JAI*, I, cxlv.
23. Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 299.
24. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 175.
25. "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 446.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 446; XL, 402-403.
27. *Missionary Travels*, p. 288.
28. Green, *Short History of the English People*, I, 6.
29. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," An. Rep. *BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 295.
30. *Life among the Apaches*, p. 43.
31. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 266, 275; XL, 136.
32. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 112-114; Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 298.
33. Cf. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 196-207, who shows how hatred of all outsiders is a natural accompaniment of human feeling for members of one's own horde. Toward outsiders hostility always prevailed.
34. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, II, 223; Wake, "Mental Characteristics of Primitive Man," *JAI*, I, 77, 80-81.
35. Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 187.

36. Price, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, I, 186; Tate, "Notes on the Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 181-182.
37. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 124-125.
38. "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 485-486.
39. *Head Hunters of Borneo*, p. 76.
40. Basedon, "Natives of Bathurst Island," *JAI*, XLIII, 291.
41. Lawes, "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 369. Cf. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 192, on the divergences of language among the Papuans of New Guinea.
42. "Duk Duk," *JAI*, XXVII, 183.
43. Godwin-Austen, "Khasi Hill Tribes," *JAI*, I, 218.
44. Peale, "Nagas and Neighbouring Tribes," *JAI*, III, 478.
45. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
46. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267-268.
47. White, "The Northwestern Provinces of South America," *JAI*, XIII, 241.
48. *History of Mankind*, I, 181.
49. *Folkways*, pp. 12-13; *War*, pp. 9-13; *Earth Hunger*, pp. 79-80.
50. *Folkways*, p. 12.
51. Cf. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 245-250; Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 48, 49.
52. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, Chap. XIII.
53. C. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 79-82.
54. Cf. Smith, *Early Arabia*, p. 56.
55. *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 4.
56. *Folkways*, p. 29.
57. Keller, "The Right to Life," *Unpopular Review*, VII, 286-301.
58. Sumner, *War*, p. 11; cf. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, p. 79; Novicow, *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, p. 11.
59. *Anthropology*, pp. 412-413.
60. *Polynesian Researches*, III, 125.
61. *The Fijians*, p. 305.
62. Thomson, "The Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 139.
63. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 327.
64. Frobenius, *Menchenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 1-4, thinks that modern warfare grew out of war with one's own kind and not out of the struggle with others. He has here confused two different lines of evolution which will be treated more fully in a later chapter.
65. Bonwick, "The Australian Natives," *JAI*, XVI, 204.
66. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 62 (quoted), 63-64.
67. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 314.
68. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 207.
69. "The Angami Nagas," *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, XLIV, I, 320.
70. "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 155.
71. Cf. Keller, *Through War to Peace*, Chaps. IX, X.
72. "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 181.
73. "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 299.
74. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 175.
75. "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 445-446.
76. *Eskimo Life*, p. 159.
77. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 413.
78. *Native Races*, I, 194.

79. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 854.
80. *Early Arabia*, p. 4.
81. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 338.
82. *Folkways*, p. 13.
83. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14, thinks that perhaps nine-tenths of all the names given by savage tribes to themselves mean "men."
84. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 92; II, 257; Muret-Sanders, *Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch*; Fiske, *Dutch and Quaker Colonies*, p. 4.
85. Wilkund, *Om Lapparna i Sverige*, p. 5, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14.
86. Von Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, II, 236.
87. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14. Cf. Keller, *Through War to Peace*, Chap. X. and Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 165 ff., where a criticism is given of the extravagant and incorrect claims made before the World War as to the peculiarity and superiority of German *Kultur*, and where also it is pointed out how such ethnocentrism is related to war.

CHAPTER III

1. *Folkways*, p. 845.
2. See Ellis, *Man and Woman*, and Ploss, *Das Weib*, for a full discussion as to asserted sex differences.
3. Briffault, *The Mothers*, I, 443 ff.
4. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 66-71, has a very excellent discussion of division of labor by sex. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, pp. 74-75, thinks this division is mainly conventional. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. V, cite many examples which substantiate the position taken here.
5. *Man and Woman*, pp. 1-2, 5.
6. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 217-219, believes that force has always been behind all division of labor—an extreme point of view. Briffault, *The Mothers*, I, 436-440, maintains that women's labor is voluntary.
7. "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 116. He has innumerable illustrations of the inferior position of women among primitive peoples.
8. "Kafiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 85.
9. For the position of women among savages, see Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 50-52; Letourneau, *Sociology*, Chap. X; Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, pp. 259-264; and Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. I and II, where hundreds of cases are cited. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 90, 273, 461, mentions several instances where women are chiefs, while Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 105-107, has some interesting facts concerning the prophetess in Central Africa. Briffault, *The Mothers*, II, 516-530, has collected a number of instances of priestesses in uncultured societies.
10. *Principles of Sociology*, I, 734. For the position of women under militancy, see I, 734-740, 743, 749, 760-763, 767-770. See Sumner, *War*, pp. 65 ff., for development of the idea that the status of women is determined largely by their economic importance.
11. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 206.
12. *The Australian Race*, I, 99.
13. Hunt, "Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 10.

14. "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 342.
15. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 25-26.
16. Burrows, "Natives of the Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 41.
17. "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 102.
18. *Sociology*, p. 176. Cf. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 495.
19. Tate, "Notes on the Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 132-133. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, III, 71-74, has collected many instances.
20. Cf. Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*. This author has collected many instances of the tasks performed by savage women. He shows that our industrial arts are largely due to them, though he perhaps exaggerates their share in developing the arts.
21. *Travels in Brazil*, II, 246. Cf. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, II, 50, 224.
22. See Ellis, *Man and Woman*, Chap. I; Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 1-2; III, 6-7; IV, 4-5; V, 6-7; VI, 5-6; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 342-346; Letourneau, *Sociology*, Chap. X; Mason, *Woman's Share*, Chaps. II-IX; Briffault, *The Mothers*, I, Chap. IX.
23. Simson, "The Jívaros," *JAI*, IX, 392.
24. Hawtrey, "The Lengua Indians," *JAI*, XXXI, 295.
25. "Les Indiens de l'état de Panama," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, VI, 44, 45.
26. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 78.
27. "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 200-201.
28. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 227.
29. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, pp. 329-330.
30. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 11.
31. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 186.
32. Kerry-Nicholls, "The Maori Race," *JAI*, XV, 196.
33. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 189.
34. Keane, "Ethnology of Egyptian Sudan," *JAI*, XIV, 96.
35. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 559.
36. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 189-190.
37. "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 342.
38. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, p. 16.
39. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 160.
40. Bastian, *Der Mensch*, III, 313, 314.
41. Cf. Nieboer, *Slavery*, p. 218. "It is remarkable that slaves in so many cases are stated to perform household, *i.e.*, female labour." This is particularly true of agriculture. *Ibid.*, pp. 217, 218, 281, 388, 389.
42. "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 124-125.
43. Cf. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 261-262. This point will be further developed when considering the treatment of prisoners of war.
44. Many excellent cases of this are to be found in Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 226-228, 434-440; and Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 388, 389.
45. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, II, 685, says: "The Negro worships force, and has a sneaking admiration for bloodshed."
46. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 51-52.
47. Cf. Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 124 ff.; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, 52 ff.
48. Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 124.

49. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, 126-134. He has taken up this matter in great detail. Briffault, *The Mothers*, III, 354-356, maintains that the continence observed by warriors in the course of preparation for an expedition does not arise from a consideration of its physiological advantages, but from notions of ritual chastity.
50. Briffault, *The Mothers*, I, 457; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 39. Aristotle, *Politics*, 2. 6, said the most warlike people were under female rule, but the direction of war was in the hands of the men.
51. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 183.
52. Burton, *A Mission to Gelele, King of Dahomi*, II, 64, 67; Ellis, *op cit.*, 183.
53. *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 184-185, 190, 191, 316, 317, 323.
54. Price, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, I, 188.
55. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth. N.S.*, II, 476.
56. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 243. See Herrera, translated by Markham for the Hakluyt Society, 1859.
57. Falkner, *Description of Patagonia*, p. 121, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, VI, 16.
58. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 764.
59. *Life among the Apaches*, p. 142.
60. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 915.
61. Ellis, *A Journal of a Tour around Hawaii*, pp. 57, 71 (quoted).
62. Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, p. 288.
63. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 32 (quoted); Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 331; III, 157.
64. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 155 note.
65. "Australian Class Systems," *JAI*, XVIII, 58.
66. Calder, "Native Tribes of Tasmania," *JAI*, III, 10.
67. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 191.
68. Hunter, *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, VIII, 188, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, V, 17.
69. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 450.
70. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 122-123.
71. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-285.
72. Tacitus, *Germania*, VII, VIII. Cf. Mason, *Woman's Share*, pp. 238-239.
73. "High Albania," *JAI*, XL, 460.
74. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 182; *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 171-172.
75. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 59.
76. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 191.
77. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 344.
78. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth. N.S.*, II, 476.
79. Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, p. 426, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, III, 15.
80. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 244.
81. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 470.
82. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 190.
83. Ellis, *A Journal of a Tour around Hawaii*, pp. 71 (quoted), 94.
84. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 407.
85. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 915.
86. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 745.

87. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 337.
88. Pizarro, p. 379, and *Andagoya*, p. 56, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 19.
89. *Germania*, VII. Cf. Mason, *Woman's Share*, pp. 238-239.
90. It is noteworthy that savages when mere boys are a part of the regular fighting force. "Every male Dakota sixteen years old and upward is a soldier." (Dorsey, "Siouan Cults," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 444-445). Among the Kafirs in India, as soon as a boy puts on long trousers he is given weapons and takes part in war. (Robertson, "Kafiristan and Its People," *JAI*, XXVII, 78-79). The boys in New Guinea are initiated into manhood at the age of ten or twelve, and they then assume man's duties. (Guise, "Tribes Inhabiting the Mouth of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 207.) At the age of about twelve, boys are initiated among the Bageshu and take up the duties of full members of the tribe. (Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 185.) Even in High Albania today, "at fifteen a tribesman is a fighting man, and is no mean foe at twelve." (Durham, "High Albania," *JAI*, XL, 454.) More information on this point will be given when treating the initiation ceremonies.
91. *Anthropology*, p. 305.
92. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 661-662; I, 499.
93. Frič and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 388.
94. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 370.
95. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 185.
96. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 183, 186. Along the Upper Congo River "the boys of the village made basketwork shields about 3 feet long and 8 inches wide, and with stout watergrass and young plantain stalks as spears they took sides, and amid much laughter and good humour fought a mimic battle until one side was driven from the field—the village street. The precision with which they threw their imitation spears was a fine exhibition of dexterity." Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 404.
97. *Travels in West Africa*, p. 380.
98. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 204-205.
99. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 68-69.
100. *Native Races*, I, 80.
101. Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 462.
102. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 744.
103. Ellis, *Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 287.
104. Letourneau, *Sociology*, Bk. III, Chap. VIII.
105. See Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 45-46, for a discussion of such cases. These ceremonies are less impressive and less important than those for boys.
106. *Ibid.*, pp. 21-24, Chaps. III, IV. Mathews, "The Bora," *JAI*, XXIV, 411-427; "The Burung," *JAI*, XXV, 310-311; "The Keepana Ceremony," *JAI*, XXVI, 320-340; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, Chaps. IX, X; Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 185-186; Willoughby, "Initiation Ceremonies of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXIX, 228-246; Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 372.
107. Cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 66 ff.

108. Cf. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 27, 28, 59, 60, Chap. VI; Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 372.
109. *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 685.
110. "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 133.
111. "The Lower Congo," *JAI*, XVII, 218.
112. Man, "The Andaman Islands," *JAI*, XII, 92.
113. Conder, "Bechuanaland," *JAI*, XVI, 88.
114. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 15.
115. Heard, "The Yezidis," *JAI*, XLI, 201.
116. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 43-44, 63.
117. *Last Journal*, p. 474.
118. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 241; Lowie, *Primitive Society*, pp. 339-342.
119. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 499.
120. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 125.
121. Stevenson, "The Sia," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 121-123.
122. Mooney, "The Kiowa Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVII, Pt. I, p. 284.
123. Fletcher and La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe," *An Rep. BAE*, XXVII, 437-448.
124. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 365-366.
125. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914. In Nicaragua, "Tapaligui" was the most honorable title and could be won only by bravery, while in Yucatan skins and feathers, worn according to fixed rules, were among the most prominent insignia of warriors. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 740, 741. Among the Araucanos of South America the esteem in which fortitude is held is seen, tinged with vanity, in their quarrels. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 368-369.
126. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 97-98. Cf. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 365.
127. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 190-191.
128. Christian, "Micronesian Weapons," *JAI*, XXVIII, 297.
129. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 35.
130. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks of Borneo*, p. 84.
131. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 216.
132. "Kafiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 80, 82.
133. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 13.
134. Croke, "Rajputs and Mahrattas," *JAI*, XL, 39; Risley, *Ethnography of India*, pp. 81, 90, 135.
135. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 42-43.
136. Ward, "The Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 291; Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 401.
137. Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 318-319.
138. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 7-8.
139. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, p. 438.
140. Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, I, 143.
141. Ross, *Social Control*, p. 223; Keller, *Through War to Peace*, pp. 140-141.
142. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 93.
143. Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 318-319.

144. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 580-581.
145. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 18 note.
146. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 98. Cf. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 365.
147. Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 232-233, 235.
148. Holmes, "Natives of the Papuan Gulf," *JAI*, XXXII, 425.
149. *Anthropology*, p. 412. This custom is very prevalent among head-hunting tribes.
150. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 5-6. Cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 49, 66, 92, 133 ff., 141, 160-161; and Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 63-71.

CHAPTER IV

1. Crantz, *Histoire van Greenland*, I, 217, quoted by Nieboer, *Slavery*, p. 252. Cf. Sumner, *War*, p. 10.
2. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, p. 4; cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 9, 23, 41, 262 ff.
3. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, pp. 101-102.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
5. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 295.
6. *Eskimo Life*, pp. 101, 117, 158, 162.
7. "The Central Eskimo," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, VI, 465.
8. Turner, "The Ungara District," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 186.
9. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 120.
10. "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 3.
11. *Native Races*, I, 91.
12. *Ibid.*, I, 129-130.
13. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, pp. 3, 35 ff.
14. *Native Races*, I, 268.
15. "The Similkameen Indians," *JAI*, XXI, 317.
16. Nicholas, "Aborigines of Santa Marta," *Amer. Anth.*, N.S., III, 612.
17. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 368-369.
18. Lowie, *Culture and Ethnology*, pp. 61-62.
19. Simson, "The Napo Indians," *JAI*, XII, 23.
20. "Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 241-284; XL, 73-140.
21. Keane, "The Lapps," *JAI*, XV, 228.
22. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., II, 475.
23. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 366. The last four words in this quotation are italicized, for the author believes that "for wars to cease, it is only necessary that their cessation should be thought in earnest possible and desirable." *Ibid.*, p. 368.
24. Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 65.
25. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 108.
26. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 14, 15-16.
27. Moggridge, "The Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 467. The Quissama tribe of Angola is "most cowardly and distrustful," its members "live in constant fear that the Portuguese or some native tribe will overrun their

- country and take possession of it." Monteiro, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, V, 199.
28. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 366; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 522.
29. *The Todas*, pp. 555, 558, 586.
30. Godwin-Austen, "The Khasi Hill Tribes," *JAI*, I, 125.
31. Quoted in Sarasin, *Die Weddahs von Ceylon*, p. 488.
32. Quoted in the above, p. 488.
33. Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 1-2, believes that the first war was the change from animal-hunting to man-hunting, and of this there appears to be some evidence, for in the lowest stages the weapons of war are not differentiated from those of the chase, and there are some instances, to be mentioned later, of tribes which hunt men for food.
34. Sarasin, *Die Weddahs von Ceylon*, pp. 469, 488, 489, 539.
35. "The Kubus of Sumatra," *JAI*, XIV, 122, 123.
36. Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 21.
37. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 413.
38. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 366.
39. Knocker, "Aborigines of Sungei Ujong," *JAI*, XXXVII, 293.
40. Morgan, *Life and Adventures of William Buckley*, p. 101, quoted by Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 307.
41. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, II, 231.
42. Sumner, *War*, p. 4; cf. Semon, *Im australischen Busch*, p. 225.
43. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 576.
44. *Sociology*, p. 199.
45. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 212-213.
46. *Sociology*, p. 509.
47. Cf. DeGroot, *Religion of the Chinese*, pp. 199 ff., 215-220; Backhouse and Bland, *Memoirs of the Court of Peking*, pp. 255 ff., 271, 313, 375, 381, 405, 422 ff., Chaps. XVI, XVII.
48. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 199-200.
49. *The Spirit of Laws*, I, 4-5.
50. *Leviathan*, pp. 63 ff.; cf. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 366-367; Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 43 ff.; Wines, *Punishment and Reformation*, Chap. II. The latter thinks the primitive state of mankind must have been one of war, both individual and tribal, for, in the absence of law, there was no way to settle disputes except by the arbitrament of force.
51. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, pp. 327, 330; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 91, 120, 129-130; Jones, *The Thlin-gets of Alaska*, pp. 112-113.
52. Lloyd, "The Beothucs," *JAI*, IV, 29-30. Written in 1875.
53. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 196.
54. Tout, "The Siciate of British Columbia," *JAI*, XXXIV, 29-30; "Tribes of Vancouver Island," *JAI*, XXXVII, 372-374.
55. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, pp. 240-241; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 229, 345, 366. The latter believes, however, that in the earlier days the Indians were by no means bloodthirsty and that in some parts wars were rather infrequent. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12, 352-353, 366. On the other hand, many tribes were distinctly warlike; see Appendix D.
56. *Native Races*, I, 628, 655.

57. *Ibid.*, II, 401-404, 418-419; Biart, *The Aztecs*, Chaps. IX, XIII; Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 197.
58. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 53 ff.; Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 197-198.
59. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 763; Roth, "Aborigines of Hispaniola," *JAI*, XVI, 250-251.
60. *Missionary Travels*, p. 199.
61. See Chaps. VIII-XI, below.
62. *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 138; *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 172, 174.
63. Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 65; Moggridge, "The Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 468; Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 38; Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 348 and note. The Masai, however, appear to be unreliable as soldiers, and the King's African Rifles have now disbanded their Masai companies.
64. *History of Mankind*, II, 344.
65. Burrows, "Natives of the Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 38.
66. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 41.
67. Peal, "Nagas and Neighbouring Tribes," *JAI*, III, 477.
68. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 161-162, 167.
69. Furness, "Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 447.
70. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 12.
71. "The Naga Hills," *JAI*, XL, 63.
72. Furness, "Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 446.
73. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 180-181; Watt, "Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 358; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 248; Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, Chap. I.
74. Holdich, "Swatis and Afridis," *JAI*, XXIX, 5. In the Chin Hills of India war was the normal condition of the people until pacified by the British. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 227.
75. "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 583.
76. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 56-88, 90 ff., 212 ff., has gone very assiduously into their tactics, weapons, etc. See also *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 261 ff., 519 ff.; III, 99, 100-101.
77. MacIver, "Recent Anthropometrical Work in Egypt," *JAI*, XXX, 103; Petrie, "Races of Early Egypt," *JAI*, XXXI, 250-255.
78. Frere, "Relations between Civilized and Savage Life," *JAI*, XI, 317-318.
79. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-285.
80. Deuteronomy 2. 32-34; 3. 3, 6; 7. 1, 2, 16; 20. 16-18; Judges 21. 10-11; I Samuel 15. 1-3, 18; 27. 8, 9; II Samuel 20. 12, 13; Psalms 68. 23; Isaiah 9. 5; Jeremiah 1. 19; 14. 18; 25. 33; 33. 5; Ezekiel 11. 6, 9, 10; 22. 20, 22-26, 28-30; 35. 8; Zephaniah 1. 17; Numbers 21. 35; Joshua 6. 21; 8. 24, 26; 10. 28, 40; I Kings 11. 13, 16.
81. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 202-212.
82. Sykes, "The Kurdish Tribes," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 453-482.
83. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 213; Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 64, 70.
84. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 183-184.
85. *History of Mankind*, I, 134.

86. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 249.
87. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 296.
88. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 8.
89. St. John, "Hill Tribes of North Aracan," *JAI*, II, 243.
90. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-93.
91. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 385.
92. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 10-11; Angus, "A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 317.
93. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 268.
94. Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 65-66.
95. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., II, 476.
96. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 368-369.
97. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 86, 100, 101.
98. "Natives of the Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XVII, 98.
99. Related to Lieut. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 386.
100. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 224-226, 226 quoted.
101. St. John, "Hill Tribes of North Aracan," *JAI*, II, 243.
102. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 249.
103. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 134.
104. *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, pp. 190, 191, 193. See also his book, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 228.
105. See Sumner, *War*, p. 3.

CHAPTER V

1. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 470.
2. Sumner, *War*, pp. 14-15, classifies the motives of war in this way. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 187-188, mentions hunger and love, but not vanity or religion, though the latter is implied throughout his discussion. See also his book, *La Guerre*. In the former case he says: "The motives of war are multiple, but if hunger takes the foremost place, love will certainly claim the second in primitive societies."
3. See Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 205. Endocannibalism, that is, eating members of one's own group, appears to have been due rather to religious motives, as when among primitive peoples mothers will eat their children who die, in order—so they think—to regain the strength they lost in giving birth; and when members of the tribe will eat the old and sick, as well as the criminals, to get rid of their souls. The idea is also held in these cases that the person practicing cannibalism is rendered stronger, or more courageous, or has taken on some other special characteristic of the person eaten, for he has taken the latter's soul when consuming his body. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 208-209, 233-234; II, 282, 284; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 331-334. In the case of exocannibalism, human flesh was eaten chiefly for the sake of food. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 280; Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 82 ff.; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 290, 291.
4. Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, p. 155.
5. *Slavery as an Industrial System*, Chaps. II, III, IV. See also Sumner, *Folkways*, Chap. VI; Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 151, 294; Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 155-160.

6. McGee, "The Seri Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVII, Pt. I, p. 261.
7. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 183.
8. Markham, "Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 249.
9. *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 1-68, 82. He shows how the man hunt, that is, war for cannibalistic purposes, was conducted against outsiders, but he bases it on the assertion that primitive man did not know the difference between men and animals, a position which is unsupported by facts.
10. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 206.
11. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 299.
12. Ray, "The People and Languages of New Ireland," *JAI*, XXI, 4.
13. "Duk Duk, etc.," *JAI*, XXVII, 181-182.
14. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 383.
15. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 105.
16. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 41.
17. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 197, 211; Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267.
18. *Sociology*, p. 209.
19. *Folklore*, p. 59, quoted by Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 33.
20. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 245.
21. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 279.
22. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 84.
23. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 208.
24. *History of the New World*, II, 495, 499, 501.
25. White, "The Northwestern Provinces of South America," *JAI*, XIII, 241.
26. Markham, "Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 245.
27. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 508.
28. *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 13, 325. Cf. Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 266.
29. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 39.
30. *Voyage à la Grande Viti* (Tour du Monde, 1860, 1^{er} semestre, 198), quoted by Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 41.
31. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 102; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 40.
32. Elton, "Natives of the Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XVII, 99.
33. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 299.
34. Palmer, "Some Australian Tribes," *JAI*, XIII, 283.
35. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 475.
36. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 245.
37. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 108; De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 445-446.
38. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 209.
39. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 445.
40. *The Maori Race*, p. 356.
41. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267; Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 197, 211.
42. Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, p. 288.
43. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa*, II, 98.
44. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 207.
45. Johnston, "Ethnology of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 395.

46. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 181.
47. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 404; "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 279, 289 (quoted); "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 134, 148.
48. *Globus*, LXXII, 120; LXXXVII, 237, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 331.
49. Ward, "The Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 298-299.
50. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 121, 457, 458.
51. Burrows, "Natives of the Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 44, 46.
52. *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 268-269.
53. "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 68, 84 (quoted), 92-93.
54. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos, etc.," *JAI*, XXX, 27 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
55. "Extracts from the Diary of Mr. James Strange," *JAI*, XXX, 53-54 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
56. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 764.
57. Markham, "Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 256. Many other tribes in this district are cannibals, most of them being also very warlike. *Ibid.*, XXIV, 241-284; XL, 73-140.
58. Keane, "The Botocudos," *JAI*, XIII, 207. Cf. Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, II, 196; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 224.
59. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 538.
60. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 361-362.
61. Lubbock, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 554.
62. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 284-285.
63. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 4, 298.
64. Reinaud, *Relation des voyages faits par les Arabes*, I, 52, 68, 70, quoted by Rockhill, "Ethnology of Tibet," *Smithsonian Report, USNM* (1893), p. 728.
65. *Australian Assn. Adv. Sci.* (1892), pp. 649-663, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 334.
66. *Le Centre de l'Afrique*, p. 108.
67. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 249.
68. Taylor, *Te Ika Maui*, p. 341, asserts that even among the chiefs there were some who could not tolerate the smell or sight of human flesh without being sick. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 445-446, thinks the desire for animal food was only a minor cause of cannibalism in this case.
69. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 108.
70. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 250.
71. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 154.
72. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 750-751.
73. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, II, 311.
74. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 266-267.
75. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 105.
76. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 148.
77. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 299.
78. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 361-362.
79. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 538.
80. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 335.
81. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 129.

82. *Fafnismal*, pp. 26, 39; *Atlakvidha*, pp. 22, 24, 36; *Atlamal*, p. 55, quoted by Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 286, 287.
83. Gomme, *Ethnology in Folklore*, p. 149.
84. Evarnitzky, *Zaporoge Kossacks* (Russ.), I, 209, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 335.
85. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 250.
86. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 105.
87. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 40-41.
88. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 366-368.
89. Bancroft, *History of the United States*, p. 368. Cf. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, 172-173.
90. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 292; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, II, 1243 ff.
91. Payne, *History of the New World*, II, 495, 499, 501.
92. Brinton, *Nagualism*, p. 34.
93. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 431.
94. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 195.
95. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, 538.
96. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 404.
97. Hardy and Elkington, *Savage South Seas*, p. 95.
98. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 266-267; Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 105.
99. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 245-246.
100. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *JAI*, XLIII, 169; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 244, 246; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 751, 752.
101. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 111.
102. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 871.
103. Balfour, "Human Skulls as Drinking and Libation Vessels," *JAI*, XXVI, 347.
104. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 284-285.
105. *History*, IV, 64, 65.
106. Balfour, "Human Skulls as Drinking and Libation Vessels," *JAI*, XXVI, 349-350.
107. Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, p. 90, thinks that cannibalism disappeared when tribes became agricultural.

CHAPTER VI

1. *Folkways*, p. 2.
2. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, pp. 25-26; cf. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, pp. 435 ff.
3. Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, Chaps. VII-IX.
4. See Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 584; Petrie, "Migrations," *JAI*, XXXVI, 189-232. Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 297 ff., maintains that neither migration nor war is due directly to overpopulation, though the position as regards quantity may be an element in the situation predisposing nations toward migration and war.

5. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 31-64; Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, p. 299.
6. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 29-32.
7. See Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 203-213, where many cases are given.
8. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 246.
9. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 129-130, 269 note.
10. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 312; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 127.
11. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 380, 628.
12. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 84; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 154; Mathews, "The Australian Native," *JAI*, XXIV, 188-189.
13. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 334, 338. Cf. Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, p. 71.
14. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 325; Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 244 (quoted).
15. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
16. Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, p. 287.
17. Dundas, "The Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 56-58, 79; Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 365-367; Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 145-147; Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, pp. 323-324. In the cases of serious warfare in these districts mentioned in Appendix F, struggle for grazing-grounds is the chief cause.
18. Petrie, "Migrations," *JAI*, XXXVI, 189-232; Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 584.
19. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 83; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9.
20. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 294.
21. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 344.
22. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 246.
23. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 562, 579; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 8, 229.
24. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., II, 475.
25. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 190.
26. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 96.
27. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 88.
28. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, p. 438.
29. Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 587-589.
30. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 73, 236, 344; Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 19, 146; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. VII.
31. Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, p. 82; *Challenge of Facts*, p. 239.
32. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 71, says that up to the beginning of modern times private warfare was considered as a legitimate means of livelihood. Novicow, *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, p. 27, states: "The idea that we can enrich ourselves more speedily by seizing the possessions of our neighbors than by working ourselves is one of the notions most deeply imbedded in the human mind." Oppenheimer, *The State*, pp. 24-25, very suggestively terms, one's own labor "the economic means" for the satisfaction of needs and robbery or the forcible appropriation of the labor of others the "political means."

33. See Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 631.
34. Such a condition is specifically stated by the following authors: Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 86; Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 470-471; Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, pp. 323-324; Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 197-198; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 416; De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 342; Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 293; Sumner, *War*, pp. 3-4, 10; Havemeyer and Keller, *Ethnography*, pp. 2-3, 9-10, 17-18, 25-26, 34-36, 74-76, 90.
35. See Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 225; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 71.
36. *The Great Illusion*, p. 51. His thesis is that whereas war in ancient times meant actual advantage to the conqueror through exploitation and enslavement, it is now economically futile, for the reason that wealth is no longer portable but is founded on credit and commercial contract. If these are tampered with in an attempt at confiscation, the credit-dependent wealth is undermined, and its collapse involves that of the conqueror (owing to the financial interdependence of the modern world, intensified by the division of labor and the facility of communication), so that if conquest is not to be self-injurious it must respect the enemy's property, in which case it becomes economically futile.
37. *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 71. He thinks that hunting led to war for booty. *Ibid.*, II, 40.
38. A special instance of war being occasioned by some phase of self-maintenance is presented in the few cases where debt is the cause. Primitive peoples hold the family or even the tribe of a debtor responsible for him, and war against them may ensue on the non-payment of the debt. This is true among the Ba-Mbala of Africa, of whom Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 408, say: "War often follows the non-payment of debts, and traders of the same tribe as the debtor are seized and often killed." It is a rule among the hill tribes of Aracan, India, that "if a debt be not paid, and the debtor should not be apprehended, the creditor's party, if strong enough, attack the debtor's village and carry off as many captives as they can." St. John, "Hill Tribes of North Aracan," *JAI*, II, 241.
39. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, p. 488.
40. Genesis 14. 11; 34. 28, 29; 49. 19; Numbers 31. 9, 11, 32-34, 36, 42-46; Deuteronomy 2. 35; 3. 7; 28. 51; Joshua 8. 27; I Samuel 3. 22; 8. 8; II Kings 3. 18, 19, 23; 8. 8; I Chronicles 5. 21; II Chronicles 14. 14, 15; 20. 25; Isaiah 21. 2; Micah 2. 4, 8; Jeremiah 4. 20; 5. 17; 25. 37-38; 50. 12; 51. 43; Judges 6. 4-6.
41. Judges 6. 3, 4; I Samuel 13. 17, 30; II Kings 13. 20; cf. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, 893.
42. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 92.
43. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 611.
44. Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 586 ff.
45. Sykes, "The Kurdish Tribes," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 453-455.
46. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 79, 165-166, 313.
47. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9.
48. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 13, 36; Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 584.
49. Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, p. 131. He regards these as not real wars but as raids, holding that "real war" does not take place until the agricultural stage and higher culture are reached. It is true that war on

a large scale does not occur until there are large populations, which was first made possible when agriculture became generally practiced, but war nevertheless existed earlier. The difference is merely a matter of degree or intensity.

50. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 133 ff., 160; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 98, 99; Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 69-70.
51. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 94-95.
52. Dundas, "History of Kitul," *JAI*, XLIII, 501.
53. Hartland, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XL, 173.
54. "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 152, 154.
55. Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 310.
56. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 72.
57. "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 65.
58. See Sumner, *Folkways*, Chaps. II, XV, where the idea is developed that the mores can make anything right.
59. *Missionary Travels*, p. 526.
60. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254.
61. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 345 (quoted); Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 449; Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, IV, 13; French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 380; Tate, "The Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 131; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 255.
62. Cummins, "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 149, 152, 154 (quoted); Hartland, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XL, 173.
63. Cummins, "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 164.
64. Dundas, "History of Kitul," *JAI*, XLIII, 483-485, 501, 542.
65. Dundas, "The Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 50-52, 56-58, 79.
66. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 108.
67. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 35-36; XXXVII, 125-127; Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 285.
68. Mullens, "People of Madagascar," *JAI*, V, 183.
69. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 111.
70. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal*, pp. 277 ff. 345 ff.; Johnston, "Ethnography of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 408-409.
71. *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, pp. 79, 323-324.
72. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 84-86.
73. Cameron, "The Anthropology of Africa," *JAI*, VI, 169.
74. Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 295.
75. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 399-400, 415.
76. Klose, *Togo*, p. 502.
77. Talbot, "The Buduma," *JAI*, XLI, 246 (quoted), 249.
78. Havemeyer and Keller, *Ethnography*, p. 198.
79. Robertson, "Kafiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 79-80.
80. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 72.
81. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 200-201.
82. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 312.
83. Deuteronomy 28. 51; Numbers 22. 4; Judges 6. 3-6; II Kings 3. 18-19, 23; Jeremiah 4. 20; 5. 17; 25. 37, 38; 50. 12; 51. 43; Micah 2. 4.
84. Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 213-214.

85. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 609; Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 298 (quoted).
86. Sykes, "The Kurdish Tribes," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 453 ff.
87. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 79, 80 (quoted), 165-166.
88. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9; Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 70-71 (quoted).
89. Havemeyer and Keller, *Ethnography*, p. 17; Mullens, "People of Madagascar," *JAI*, V, 183.
90. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 228.
91. Turner, "The Motu," *JAI*, VII, 472, 492.
92. Chalmers, "Toaripi," *JAI*, XXVII, 326.
93. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 192.
94. Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 89; Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 200-201, 203.
95. French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 380.
96. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 39-46; Moggridge, "Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 467.
97. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 9-10.
98. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 477, 481; Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, p. 204.
99. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 40.
100. Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 295.
101. Elliot, "Native West African Customs," *JAI*, XXIII, 82.
102. *History of Mankind*, II, map facing p. 387.
103. Cantacuzene, *Romana Historia*, IV, 20, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 264.
104. Markham, "Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 250.
105. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 154.
106. Nachtigall, *Sahara und Sudan*, II, 104, 110.
107. Aymard, *Les Touareg*, p. 37.
108. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 263-264.
109. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, III, 7, 91; *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 310 ff.
110. *Principles of Sociology*, III, 473, 474.
111. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 261.
112. Cf. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 127; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 471-473; Nieboer, *Slavery*, Chap. IV; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. X.
113. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 349; cf. Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 187-248.
114. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 103; Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 349; Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 265.
115. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 349; Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 198; Johnston, *The Negro in the New World*, pp. 86 ff., 77 ff., 110 ff., 130 ff., 206 ff.
116. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 258, 260, 261.
117. Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, IV, 18.
118. Steere, "East African Tribes," *JAI*, I, cxliv; Stigand, "Natives of Nyassaland," *JAI*, XXXVII, 125.

119. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 111.
120. Angus, "A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 317; Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 35-36; Stigand, "Natives of Nyassaland," *JAI*, XXXVII, 125-127; Moggridge, "Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 468.
121. Monteiro, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, V, 199.
122. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 142-143, 145; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 398.
123. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 140.
124. Klose, *Togo*, pp. 382, 383 (quoted), 502.
125. Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an der Laongo-Küste*, I, 180.
126. Talbot, "The Buduma," *JAI*, XLI, 249.
127. Read and Dalton, "Works of Art from Benin City," *JAI*, XXVII, 369; Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 5.
128. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 218.
129. *Ibid.*, pp. 188, 190, 198, 293; Johnston, *The Negro in the New World*, pp. 81-82, 133, 300, 343, Chaps. III-XI.
130. Warnshuis, "Slavery in 1926," *The Survey*, LVI (Aug. 1, 1926), 485.
131. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 40.
132. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 413-414. Cf. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 38-39.
133. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, p. 96.
134. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 192; Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, III, 95, 345; IV, 161.
135. Cf. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 126-127.
136. Swanton, "The Tlingit Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 449; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 108.
137. Tout, "Tribes of Vancouver Island," *JAI*, XXXVII, 372; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 168, 195 (quoted), 240; Sproat, *Scenes*, p. 92, quoted by Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 217.
138. Nieboer, *Slavery*, pp. 204-210; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, pp. 597-598.
139. Hostmann, *De Beschaving van Negers in Amerika*, I, Chap. IV, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 270; Carr, "Mounds of the Mississippi Valley," *Smithsonian Report*, 1891, pp. 520, 525, 532; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 296.
140. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 197.
141. Johnston, *The Negro in the New World*, pp. 34-35, 38; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. I, p. 464; Pt. II, p. 600.
142. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 729. Cf. Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 18.
143. Koch, "Die Guikuru-Stämme," *Globus*, LXXXI, 44, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 271.
144. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 72.
145. De Varnhagen, *Historia Geral do Brazil*, I, 431, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 272.
146. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 191 (quoted), 277, 293 (quoted), 294; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 610.
147. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-284.
148. Genesis 34. 29; Deuteronomy 20. 13; II Samuel 8. 4; I Chronicles 18. 4; II Chronicles 28. 8, 17; Numbers 21. 1; 31. 9, 11, 12; I Samuel 30. 2, 3; Jeremiah 41. 10; 48. 15; Amos 1. 6.
149. Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 213-214.

CHAPTER VII

1. Among the Hudson Bay Indians it is said that a weak man is seldom permitted to keep a wife that a stronger man thinks worth his notice. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 101-102. Richardson (quoted in Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 701) more than once saw a stronger man among the Copper Indians assert his right to the wife of a weaker tribesman. Bancroft (*Native Races*, I, 86) says the Tinneh regard "all property, including wives, as belonging to the strongest." Lowie (*Primitive Society*, p. 68) writes of the Crow Indians: "Two rival military organizations of this tribe indulged in licensed wife-stealing at the beginning of every spring, the sole qualification being that a man might abduct only women with whom he had once been on terms of intimacy. In such a case the husband was without redress and any attempt to resort to force would permanently injure his social prestige." Of the Záparos of Ecuador, Simson ("The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 505) says, "The stealing of women is much carried on even amongst themselves." Such cases are exceedingly rare.
2. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 54.
3. *Origin of Civilization*, p. 84. Cf. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, § 358.
4. *History of Human Marriage*, Chap. XXI, p. 253 (quoted).
5. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. XLVI.
6. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 187-188.
7. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, Chap. XXIII, *passim*; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. XLI, XLVII, L.
8. Sumner, *War*, pp. 7-8, 48, 65 ff.; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 109, 345-346, 355-357, Chap. IX; Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 155-156, 209, 221, 226, on sex mores; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 32, 48, 66, 74, 78, 85-93, 106-129.
9. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 4.
10. See Letourneau, *Sociology*, Bk. IV, Chap. I. He has a great many instances of this fact; see also Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, § 383.
11. Cummins, "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 150.
12. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXI, 122; XXXII, 36; Johnstone, "Mombasa Sub-District," *JAI*, XXVII, 269; Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 35-36; Moggridge, "The Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 468.
13. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 49.
14. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 78 (quoted), 226.
15. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 175, 185-186.
16. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-93.
17. Lewin, *Wild Races of S. E. India*, p. 91.
18. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 99.
19. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 37.
20. Turner, "The Motu," *JAI*, VII, 473.
21. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 416. Women here are the chief cause of blood feuds. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
22. Williamson, "The Mekeo People," *JAI*, XLIII, 285; Von Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 251.
23. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, p. 96.

24. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 88.
25. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 325; Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, pp. 240, 244.
26. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
27. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 84. Cf. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 30.
28. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 489-490, 556-557.
29. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 339; II, 477.
30. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 154, 155, note; II, 317.
31. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 195, 207-208, 236 (quoted), Chap. V.
32. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 343-344. Cf. Lubbock, "Customs of Marriage," *JAI*, XIV, 297.
33. Crooke, "The Central Indian Hills," *JAI*, XXVIII, 241.
34. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 72, 85-88, 94.
35. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, pp. 162-163.
36. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 235, 343, 380.
37. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 312; Carr, "Mounds of the Mississippi Valley," *Smithsonian Report*, 1891, pp. 520, 524; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 296.
38. Simson, "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 505; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 225.
39. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 277, 279-280, 293; cf. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 610.
40. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 72-73, 283-284, 284-285 (quoted).
41. *Dictionary of the Bible*, I, 847.
42. Genesis 34. 28, 29; 14. 16-21; Jeremiah 41. 10; 48. 46; II Chronicles 28. 8, 17; Numbers 21. 1, 29; 31. 9, 11, 12; I Samuel 30. 2-19; Amos 1. 6.
43. Deuteronomy 21. 10-14
44. Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 213-214.
45. Schrader, *Aryan Peoples*, pp. 383 ff.
46. Durham, "High Albania," *JAI*, XL, 459; Heard, "The Yezidis," *JAI*, XLI, 210 (written in 1912).
47. Park and Miller, *Old World Traits Transplanted*, pp. 156-157.
48. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 54, 356-357; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, § 371; Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 73-84; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 93-105. These authors cite many cases of mock capture. Lippert thinks it is common to all races. Westermarck (*History of Human Marriage*, II, 255-277) thinks such practices can be explained otherwise. Examples of mock capture are cited by the following authors: Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 62; Dundas, "History of Kitui" *JAI*, XLIII, 520; Johnstone, "Mombasa Sub-District," *JAI*, XXXII, 271, 272; Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 104; Macdonald, "Tribes Met during the Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 238; Crooke, "Central Indian Hills," *JAI*, XXVIII, 240; Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 381; Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 305; Williamson, "The Mekeo People," *JAI*, XLIII, 275; Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 9; Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 85, 86; Fric and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 390; Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, I, 180, 182; II, 144 ff; Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*,

- XXXIX, 359; Smith, *Early Arabia*, p. 80; Douglas, "Social and Religious Ideas of the Chinese," *JAI*, XXII, 166; Heard, "The Yezidis," *JAI*, XLI, 214; Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 68.
49. Cf. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 356, and Chap. XV, below.
50. *History of Human Marriage*, II, 1-4, 33 (quoted); cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 87.
51. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 99.
52. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 122-123.
53. Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 142.
54. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, II, 155, note, 292.
55. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
56. Lubbock, "Customs of Marriage," *JAI*, XIV, 292-293. He thinks wife-capture was the chief factor in causing this change, but cattle raising also had great effect, for it gave man a superior economic position which was reflected in the marriage mores. It is noteworthy that the mother-family does not prevail to any extent among tribes that have reached the pastoral stage. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 82 ff.
57. *Folkways*, p. 355. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 25 ff.
58. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 631-634. Without fully accepting Spencer's views on the origin of exogamy, or even going into the subject, for it does not concern us here, it is still very evident that capturing a wife from another group had effect on the custom of exogamy and helped to dissolve the endogamous mother-family. Cf. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, Chap. XX, on exogamy.
59. See Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 350; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 44, 85; Tylor, "Marriage and Descent," *JAI*, XVIII, 267-268; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, III, 1618.
60. See Keller, *Societal Evolution*, Chap. III, on automatic selection.
61. Cf. Mason, *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*.
62. Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 213-214; Smith, *Early Arabia*, p. 285.
63. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 671, 673; Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, III, 53, 54, 59 ff. See Chap. XVI, below, for the effect of war on population.

CHAPTER VIII

1. Sumner, *War*, pp. 14-15, 25. See Chap. XV, below, for the effect of religion on the development of peace.
2. It is not to be assumed that all supernatural beings, e.g., nature spirits, are modeled on the idea of the human soul. Cf. Lowie, *Primitive Religion*, pp. 105 ff.
3. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 429, Chap. XI; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, Pt. I, Chaps. X-XIII; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 3, 7, 28-30, 67, 79; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 125; and Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. XXII-XXIV, where hundreds of cases are cited.
4. *Primitive Religion*, Chaps. XV-XVII.
5. *Early Civilization*, pp. 197 (quoted), 198-201.
6. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 6, 11, 144. Cf. Keller, "The Luck Element," *Scientific Monthly*, IV, 145-150; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. XXI.

7. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 94; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 86, 92, 779; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 199, 203, 207, 208.
8. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. XXV-XXVII.
9. Sumner, *War*, pp. 129-146.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.
11. Harrison, "Religion and Family among the Haidas," *JAI*, XXI, 18-19.
12. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 89.
13. *Ibid.*, II, 86.
14. Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 139.
15. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 41.
16. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 183-184.
17. Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 307.
18. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 36 (quoted); XXVI, 198.
19. Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 380.
20. Holmes, "Religious Ideas of the Elema Tribe," *JAI*, XXXII, 428.
21. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 318-319.
22. O'Ferrall, "Native Stories from Santa Cruz and Reef Islands," *JAI*, XXXIV, 229.
23. "Traditions of the Hervey Islands," *JAI*, VI, 3, 4 (quoted).
24. Lister, "Natives of Fakaofu," *JAI*, XXI, 51.
25. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 426. He has collected many instances of this nature. Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 88.
26. Simson, "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 506-507.
27. Im Thurn, "Animism of the Indians of British Guiana," *JAI*, XI, 375.
28. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 426; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 88.
29. Von Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, II, 412; Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 318; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 89.
30. Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 75-76.
31. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 425-435.
32. This is so universal a fact that it would be impractical to denote all the instances where it occurs. Some examples are: Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 446-475; Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXI, 120; Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 120; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 50; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 290; Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 197-198; Risley, *Ethnography of India*, p. 200; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 357 ff.; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 187, 208, 426. To put weapons in the grave was a fitting honor for a brave man; among the Greeks, to bury a man without them would be to treat him as a captive or slave who owned no arms. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 480.
33. "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 183-184.
34. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 225; Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 455 (quoted).
35. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 201.
36. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 458-459.
37. Im Thurn, "Animism of the Indians of British Guiana," *JAI*, XI, 375.
38. Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 233, 235. Not so with the Suk and Nandi, who bury nobody, though a chief is distinguished by slaughtering an ox by his body. *Ibid.*, 238. See also Featherman, *Nigritians*, pp. 81, 103, quoted by Crooke, "Primitive Rites of Disposal of the

- Dead," *JAI*, XXIX, 275; Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 43-49; Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 91, 102, 109; Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXVIII, 108; Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 314; Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 26 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
39. Featherman, *Nigritians*, pp. 24, 116, quoted by Crooke, "Primitive Rites of Disposal of the Dead," *JAI*, XXIX, 283.
40. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 431.
41. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXI, 121.
42. Crooke, "Primitive Rites of Disposal of the Dead," *JAI*, XXIX, 272, 273, 280. Cf. Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 305.
43. Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 87.
44. Moggridge, "The Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 470.
45. Werner, *Natives of British Central Africa*, pp. 160, 289; Crooke, "Primitive Rites of Disposal of the Dead," *JAI*, XXIX, 275; Bancroft, *Native Races*, III, 542.
46. Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 305-306; Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 13.
47. *Principles of Sociology*, I, 254-258, 281, 428, 781.
48. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 376, 380; Hetherwick, "Animistic Beliefs among the Yaos," *JAI*, XXXII, 92, 93; Sheane, "Awemba Religion," *JAI*, XXXVI, 151-152.
49. Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 303.
50. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 113; Sheane, "Awemba Religion," *JAI*, XXXVI, 151-152.
51. Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 300.
52. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 166.
53. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 401 (quoted); Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 378.
54. Grant, "Magato and His Tribe," *JAI*, XXXV, 270.
55. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 101-102, 109.
56. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs in Melanesia," *JAI*, X, 305.
57. Thomson, "The Kalou-Vu of the Fijians," *JAI*, XXIV, 343.
58. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, II, 258.
59. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 361.
60. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 396-401.
61. Cf. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 360-361.
62. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 50 (quoted); Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 68, 69; Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 38, 40, 67, 68.
63. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 26 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
64. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 109; Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 74.
65. Tate, "The Kikuyu Tribe," *JAI*, XXXIV, 263.
66. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 361; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 307-308.
67. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 196, 197, 212.
68. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 51.
69. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 295.
70. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 306-307.

71. Fletcher, "Significance of the Scalp-Lock," *JAI*, XXVII, 438-439, 443, 446, 450.
72. Dorsey, "Siouan Cults," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 444-445.
73. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 307. See chapter below on Human Sacrifice.
74. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 346-347.
75. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 225.
76. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 560.
77. Joshua 10. 40 (quoted); Deuteronomy 7. 1, 2, 16; 20. 16-18; Judges 7. 22; 21. 10, 11; I Samuel 15. 1, 2, 3, 18; Jeremiah 1. 26; Isaiah 19. 2; Ezekiel 38. 21.
78. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 308; cf. Doolittle, *Chinese*, I, 267.
79. Waddell, *Buddhism of Tibet*, pp. 88, 375.
80. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 295.
81. Chadwick, "The Oak and Thunder-God," *JAI*, XXX, 22.
82. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 86-88; Holdich, "Swatis and Afridis," *JAI*, XXIX, 6; Robertson, "Kafiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 79-80; all mention cases of wars being incited by prophets or priests. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 426.
83. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 88.
84. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
85. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 416.
86. Beazley, in *Encyclopædia Britannica*. (11th ed.), VII, 72.
87. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 325.
88. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
89. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 42.
90. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 20.
91. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, esp. I, 52-219, gives an excellent treatment of magic. Cf. Sumner, *War*, pp. 105-126; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 58, 114, 209-211, 241, on witchcraft; 419, 433, 446-447, 519, 555, on magic. Hundreds of cases are given in Sumner and Keller, *The Science of Society*, Chap. XXXVII.
92. *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 29.
93. Lawes, "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 373-374.
94. Price, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, I, 192-193.
95. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 389; Somerville, "New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 386.
96. Cf. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 132 ff.; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 203, 300, 301, 305, 308.
97. Hodson, "The 'Genna,'" *JAI*, XXXVI, 99.
98. *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 815 (quoted), 819.
99. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
100. Holmes, "The Elema Tribes," *JAI*, XXXIII, 132.
101. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 119-120.
102. *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 48.
103. *The Australian Race*, I, 84, 85 (quoted).
104. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, pp. 68-71.
105. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 130, 154. The most frequent cause of war among the Pegulloburra tribe is the belief in deaths from incantations. Curr, *The Australian Race*, II, 477. The same general conditions prevail in Central Australia. Spencer and Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 556-558.

106. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 343-344.
107. Simson, "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 506.
108. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 352-353.
109. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 474-476.
110. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 198-199.
111. Cf. Hollis, "History of Vumba," *JAI*, XXX, 275.
112. Burekhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 273-274, 313, 318-319 (quoted); cf. Von Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, I.
113. See Keller, *Colonization*, Chaps. IV, VII, VIII, IX; Keane, "The Botocudos," *JAI*, XIII, 205; White, "The Northwestern Provinces of South America," *JAI*, XIII, 246; Roth, "Aborigines of Hispaniola," *JAI*, XVI, 247-286; Frič and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 382-406; Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 334-370; Simson, "The Jívaros," *JAI*, IX, 385-393; Hawtrey, "The Lengua Indians," *JAI*, XXXI, 280-299.

CHAPTER IX

1. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, p. 317.
2. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 2 ff., 37, 54, 88, 359; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. XV; also Chap. II, above.
3. According to modern embryology not a drop of blood passes from parent to offspring. Primitive peoples generally hold the opposite view, which is strengthened by their seeing blood at birth and by their belief which identifies the seat of the soul or life with the blood. Cf. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 496; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 79 ff.; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 146-150, 213.
4. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 25, 156, 325, 333; also Chap. XV, below.
5. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 496; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, § 178; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, III, 219; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 326.
6. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 415.
7. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 498; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 415; Jenks, *State and Nation*, p. 83. See Chap. XV, below.
8. For an explanation of group solidarity in terms of *mana*, see Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, pp. 199-201.
9. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 133-134; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 412-415; Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 408.
10. Numbers 35. 31.
11. II Samuel 14. 7.
12. Numbers 25. 22, 23, 27.
13. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 386-387.
14. Genesis 4. 14, 15.
15. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 390-392; Lane, *Modern Egypt*, I, 295, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 505.
16. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, pp. 438, 451.
17. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 2-3, 22-23 (quoted), 23-24 (quoted), 86-89, 53, 160-161, 283-285.
18. Burekhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 76 (quoted), 81, 84-85, 86, 87, 88-89, 174-175 (quoted), 177, 178-179 (quoted), 183-184. Cf. Procksch, *Blutrache bei den Arabern*, pp. 18, 30, 33, 36, 51, 54, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, 505.

19. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9.
20. Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 65.
21. Schrader, *The Aryan Peoples*, pp. 397 ff.
22. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 88.
23. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 238, 283 (quoted), 286; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 89.
24. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 327.
25. Green, *Short History of the English People*, p. 4.
26. Schrader, *The Aryan Peoples*, p. 397.
27. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 418.
28. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 502, referring to Geijer, *Svenska Folkets Historia*, I, 300.
29. Schrader, *The Aryan Peoples*, p. 397.
30. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur*, p. 453.
31. Kovalesky, "Lex Barbarorum of the Daghestan," *JAI*, XXV, 113.
32. Durham, "Montenegrin Manners and Customs," *JAI*, XXXIX, 89.
33. Durham, "High Albania," *JAI*, XL, 465-466.

CHAPTER X

1. Sacrifice of goods belongs under self-maintenance. See Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. XXXIII, XXXIV.
2. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 240-243; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 278; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 271, 383, 389, 398, 403; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chaps. XXXV, XXXVI.
3. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 292; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 269-271; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, II, 389.
4. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 278; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 458 ff.
5. Angus, "A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 317, 322, 382 (quoted).
6. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 126 (quoted), 293.
7. Sheane, "Awemba Religion," *JAI*, XXXVI, 157.
8. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 207-208.
9. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 458.
10. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
11. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, pp. 106-107.
12. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 400.
13. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 184.
14. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 613-614.
15. Cardi, "Ju-Ju Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XXIX, 54.
16. *The Ewe-Speaking Peoples*, pp. 137, 188, 267.
17. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 202, 207-208; Hildburgh, "Sinhalese Magic," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 189, 190-191; Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 75; Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 67, note; Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 303-304.
18. Chalmers, "Toaripi," *JAI*, XXVII, 333.
19. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, pp. 54, 105.

20. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *JAI*, X, 309-310.
21. Roth, "Maori Tatu," *JAI*, XXXI, 44.
22. Ward, "The Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 291.
23. Garbutt, "Witchcraft and Superstition in South Africa," *JAI*, XXXIX, 551-552.
24. II Kings 3.26, 27.
25. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 117, 119, 120, 138, Chap. VIII.
26. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, Chaps. III-VII, XI.
27. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 65, 66-67, 68, 166, 169-170 (quoted).
28. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 49, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 81, 104-106.
29. Roth, *Great Benin*, pp. 68-84; Granville, "The Jekris," *JAI*, XXVIII, 117.
30. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, p. 147.
31. Godwin-Austen, "Garo Hill Tribes," *JAI*, II, 394.
32. Bock, *Reis in Borneo*, pp. 9, 78, 99, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 274.
33. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 207-208.
34. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 295.
35. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 404; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 366, 368; Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 137.
36. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, I, 81.
37. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 400 (quoted), 420, 426, 431; Biart, *The Aztecs*, pp. 165-166, Chap. VIII.
38. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 707-708, 745, 746, 747; Ximenez, *Las Historias del Origen de los Indios de Guatemale*, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 18.
39. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 363.
40. *History*, VII, 180.
41. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 120.
42. Plutarch, *Themistocles*, XIII, cited in Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 300.
43. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, I, 183, and Suetonius, *Octavius*, XV, cited in Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 301-302.
44. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 302-303.

CHAPTER XI

1. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 29-30, 59-60; Evans, "Religious Beliefs of the Dusuns," *JAI*, XLII, 387, 389.
2. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 123; Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 25, 259.
3. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 415.
4. Albertis, *New Guinea*, II, 133-134, 378-379.
5. Forbes, "Tribes of the Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 423.
6. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 399-400.
7. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
8. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
9. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 25-26 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
10. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 159.

11. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 180; Woodthorpe, "The Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 202, 205; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 247, 248.
12. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 230.
13. Evans, "Religious Beliefs of the Dusuns," *JAI*, XLII, 887-888.
14. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 197; Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, pp. 210-211.
15. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 84; Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 59.
16. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, III, 166.
17. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 15.
18. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 25-26 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
19. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 87.
20. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 159.
21. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 87.
22. Haddon, *Head-Hunters*, p. 397.
23. *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, p. 59.
24. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 211.
25. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, pp. 215-216.
26. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 142, 143.
27. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, pp. 74-75.
28. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, p. 140.
29. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *JAI*, X, 308, 309-310; Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 400.
30. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
31. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 327, 328.
32. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 159 (quoted), 183-184.
33. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 455.
34. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, 459.
35. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, pp. 84, 143.
36. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 60; Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 141; Haddon, *Head-Hunters*, p. 394; Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 201 and note.
37. Pryer, "Natives of British North Borneo," *JAI*, XVI, 283.
38. Hose, "Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXIII, 168.
39. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, p. 75.
40. *Head-Hunters*, p. 394.
41. *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 99, 163.
42. *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 73.
43. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 59-60; Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 215.
44. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 38.
45. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 123; cf. Haddon, *Head-Hunters*, pp. 107-108.
46. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 414-416.
47. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
48. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 346.
49. Forbes, "Tribes of the Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 424-425.
50. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 150-151 (quoted), 159.
51. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 24 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
52. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 15.

53. *Ibid.*, XXVI, 173.
54. Peal, "Nagas," *JAI*, III, 477.
55. Furness, "Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 455.
56. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 180, 188; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 248; Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 199, 202, 205 ff.
57. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 25.
58. "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 247.
59. Forbes, "Tribes of the Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 423-424.
60. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 38.
61. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 415-416.
62. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 123.
63. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 24-25 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
64. Pryer, "Natives of British North Borneo," *JAI*, XVI, 233.
65. "Religious Beliefs of the Dusuns," *JAI*, XLII, 389-390.
66. Haddon, *Head-Hunters*, p. 394; Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 72.
67. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 204-205.
68. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 97.
69. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 415-416.
70. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
71. Brinton, *Ethnography*, I, Pt. III, p. 206.
72. Hardy and Elkington, *Savage South Seas*, p. 97.
73. Codrington, "Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia," *JAI*, X, 309-310.
74. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, pp. 75, 96.
75. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 398.
76. Woodford, "The British Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XXXIX, 510-511.
77. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 358, 391, 398-399, 410 (quoted).
78. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 180, 181; XXVII, 12, 16; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 248; Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 202, 205, 211; Watt, "Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 358.
79. Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 246-247; Furness, "Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 446.
80. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 227.
81. "Montenegrin Manners and Customs," *JAI*, XXXIX, 94.

CHAPTER XII

1. Breysig, *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*, pp. 191-192.
2. Jones, *The Thlingets of Alaska*, p. 112.
3. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XL, 101.
4. See Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 157-164; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, Chap. VI; Avebury, *Prehistoric Times*, p. 555; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 48 ff.
5. Christian, "The Gauchos of San Jorge," *JAI*, XI, 44-45.
6. "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 504-505.
7. "Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 317.
8. *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 347.
9. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-93.

10. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 79.
11. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 295 ff.
12. Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, IV, 13.
13. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 415-416.
14. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 128.
15. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 154, 156 (quoted); Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 77.
16. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 227, 228.
17. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 99.
18. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 38.
19. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 325, 327 (quoted); Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 244.
20. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 470.
21. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 192.
22. Saunderson, "Corea and Its People," *JAI*, XXIV, 314.
23. Cf. Jordan, "The Peace Myth," *American Mercury*, II, 1-9.
24. Swanton, "Tlingit Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 449.
25. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 201.
26. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 127.
27. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 763; II, 745 (quoted).
28. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 190.
29. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254.
30. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 290.
31. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 88. The population was divided into a large number of distinct tribes governed by petty rival chiefs. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 265-266.
32. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 470, 471, 474.
33. Philippi, "Easter Island," *JAI*, V, 112.
34. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 189.
35. Angell, *The Great Illusion*, Pt. I, Chaps. II, VIII; Keller, *Through War to Peace*, Chaps. X, XIV; Sumner, *War*, pp. 303, 304, 339-344; Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 46, 51.
36. Angell, *The Great Illusion*, Pt. I, Chap. VII.
37. Sumner, *War*, pp. 292, 297-334; Keller, *Through War to Peace*, p. 103; Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 173 ff.
38. Cf. Roth, "Tatu in the Society Islands," *JAI*, XXXV, 283.
39. Buckland, "Tattooing," *JAI*, XVII, 325; Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 64, 76, 81; Roth, "Maori Tatu and Moko," *JAI*, XXXI, 44, 47; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 72-74, 80-81.
40. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, p. 147.
41. Pryer, "Natives of British North Borneo," *JAI*, XVI, 233. Cf. Evans, "Religious Beliefs of the Dusuns," *JAI*, XLII, 381. With the prohibition of head-hunting, this custom is now obsolete.
42. Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 64.
43. Hose, "The Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXIII, 167.
44. Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 78 (quoted), 83-84 (quoted), 85.
45. Buckland, "Tattooing," *JAI*, XVII, 323.
46. Williamson, "The Mekeo People," *JAI*, XLIII, 269.
47. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 207.

48. Lawes, "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 370.
49. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 74.
50. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 125.
51. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 35.
52. Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 247.
53. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 185; XXVII, 21.
54. Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 247.
55. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 185.
56. Buckland, "Tattooing," *JAI*, XVII, 325.
57. Roth, "Tatu in the Society Islands," *JAI*, XXXV, 284-285.
58. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 100.
59. Kerry-Nicholls, "The Maori Race," *JAI*, XV, 203-204. Cf. Roth, "Maori Tatu and Moko," *JAI*, XXXI, 30, 51.
60. Roth, "Maori Tatu and Moko," *JAI*, XXXI, 48-49.
61. Taylor, *Te Ika Maui*, p. 152.
62. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 85, 86.
63. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 80-81. He traces tattooing from mutilations which arose from trophy-taking. This applies only in part, for vanity is a strong motive underlying the custom.
64. Lubbock, *Origin of Civilization*, pp. 40-49. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 364-444, has a splendid treatment of savage adornment.
65. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 367. He believes that adornment is fundamentally for this purpose, and that behind it is the instinct of vanity.
66. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914; Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 244. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, p. 339, says that "with the Plains Indians the quest of military renown was as hypertrophied as ever has been the lust for gold in our most money-mad centers of high finance."
67. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 37, 38, 41-45.
68. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, II, 1292-1296.
69. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, Pt. IV, Chap. II. Spencer cites instances where the trophy is made an offering to the ruler, and he traces in a suggestive way the social, religious, and political effects of the custom of preserving trophies, but he fails to give sufficient weight to the factor of vanity.
70. Fletcher, "Significance of the Scalp-lock," *JAI*, XXVII, 443.
71. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 41; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914; Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 244.
72. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 127.
73. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 433 (quoted), 500 (quoted), 581.
74. Lewis and Clarke, *Travels*, p. 309, quoted by Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 434 note.
75. I Samuel 17. 54; Judges 7. 25.
76. II Maccabees 15. 30; II Samuel 4. 12; Judges 1. 6, 7; I Samuel 18. 25, 27.
77. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 88; Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, I, 131, quoted by Spencer, II, 44, 45. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 390.
78. Douglas, "Social and Religious Ideas of the Chinese," *JAI*, XXII, 172-173.
79. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chaps. LXIV, LXV; cf. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, 202-212.

80. Morier, *Second Journey through Persia* (1818), p. 186, quoted by Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 39.
81. Lehuierou, *Histoire des institutions Carolingiennes*, p. 371; Pardessus, *Loi salique*, pp. 320, 658, quoted by Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 48.
82. *London Times*, Dec. 14, 1876; cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 42.
83. *Principles of Sociology*, II, Pt. IV, Chaps. III, IX.

CHAPTER XIII

1. This was Sumner's definition; see *Folkways*, p. 12; also Keller, *Through War to Peace*, p. 35.
2. See Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 3-4; Keller, *Societal Evolution*, Chap. III.
3. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 244 ff.; Ross, *Social Control*, Chap. VII.
4. Mucke, *Horde und Familie*; Starcke, *The Primitive Family*; Gumplowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, 196-207; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 79 ff.
5. *Sociology*, pp. 453, 473.
6. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 405.
7. Rivers, *Social Organization*, pp. 160-166.
8. Dealey, *State and Government*, pp. 26-28, 286, 356; Jenks, *State and Nation*, Chaps. IV, VI.
9. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 331 ff.; Ross, *Social Control*, pp. 78 ff.
10. For instances of tribes that are unable to unite against a common enemy, see Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 460; Holdich, "Swatis and Afridis," *JAI*, XXIX, 7, 8; De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 182; Allen, "The Papuan and Negritto Races," *JAI*, VIII, 47; Calder, "Native Tribes of Tasmania," *JAI*, III, 24; Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 191; Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 231-232, 237; Klose, *Togo*, p. 279; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 298; Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 592; Grant, "Magato and His Tribe," *JAI*, XXXV, 267; Dundas, "History of Kitul," *JAI*, XLIII, 483-485; Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 2-3, 9; Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 64.
11. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 285, mentions as factors favoring or hindering political integration: the nature of the habitat, the facilities for intercourse, the physical, emotional, and intellectual natures of the individuals of the group, etc. See Dealey, *State and Government*, Chaps. II, III, for the social background of the state and the development of political government.
12. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 365.
13. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 432.
14. Edwards, *History of the British Colonies*, I, 49, quoted by Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 522.
15. Dobrizhoffer, *Account of the Abipones*, II, 103, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, VI, 16.
16. Markham, "Tribes of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 242, 260, 284; Dorsey,

- "Siouan Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XV, 223; Breysig, *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*, I, 193.
17. Hale, "Four Huron Wampum Records," *JAI*, XXVI, 226-227.
 18. Tylor, "The Tasmanians," *JAI*, XXIII, 150. Cf. Letourneau, *Sociology*, 453; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 29.
 19. Best, "Maori Nomenclature," *JAI*, XXXII, 183.
 20. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 239.
 21. Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 372.
 22. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 190.
 23. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 166.
 24. Ross, *Social Control*, pp. 50 (quoted), 364.
 25. Dealey, *State and Government*, p. 314; cf. Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, p. 280; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 520-525, 579-586; II, 365; Giddings, *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, pp. 213-217.
 26. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 359.
 27. Dealey, *State and Government*, p. 184; *Cambridge Ancient History*, III, 99.
 28. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, 288-310.
 29. *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 163-175, 179-181, 219-238, 250-259.
 30. *Homeric Society*, p. 248.
 31. *State and Government*, pp. 2, 3 (quoted), 4-5 (quoted).
 32. *State and Nation*, pp. 121, 133, and 152 (quoted), Chap. IX.
 33. *The State*, pp. 15, 20.
 34. *Elements of Folk Psychology*, pp. 287, 289.
 35. *In Democracy and Reconstruction*, p. 486. Cf. Ross, *Social Control*, pp. 395-396; Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 162-163; Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 48 ff., 81 ff.
 36. Dealey, *State and Government*, pp. 4, 48, 59, 66 (quoted); Jenks, *State and Nation*, p. 11.
 37. See Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 104-106.
 38. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 77.
 39. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 191.
 40. Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 40, 42 (quoted).
 41. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 375, 376-377.
 42. Grant, "Magato and His Tribe," *JAI*, XXXV, 267.
 43. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 50-51, 62-64; Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 119.
 44. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 39, 40-41, 44.
 45. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 139, 140, 147, 149.
 46. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 276-277, 288, 290-294; XX, 124, 131; cf. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 229.
 47. African instances where the chief or king is also the magician or is revered as a god may be found in Bastian, *Deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste*, I, 268; Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 685; Dundas, "The Wawanga," *JAI*, XLIII, 26-27, 57-58; Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 96-99; Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXI, 128-130; Grant, "Magato and His Tribe," *JAI*, XXXV, 266, 267; Garbutt, "Superstition in South Africa," *JAI*, XXXIX, 548, 550; Willoughby, "The Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 302; Sheane, "Awemba Religion," *JAI*, XXXVI, 154; Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 29-30 (*Anthrop. Miscell.*); Sibree, "The Malagasy," *JAI*,

- XXI, 217-226; Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 140; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 51. For other cases see Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, 47-51; III, 19-25, 241-243. Frazer has collected many instances of this nature and has developed the subject as no other author has done. See also Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 466-498.
48. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 489.
49. See Gibson, *The Story of the Zulus*; Frere, "Relations between Civilized and Savage Life," *JAI*, XI, 332-333; Shooter, *Kafirs of Natal*, Chap. X; Macdonald, "South African Customs," *JAI*, XIX, 286-287, 289, 290.
50. Roth, *Great Benin*, pp. 62, 91-96, 128; Read and Dalton, "Benin City" *JAI*, XXVII, 367-368; Granville and Roth, "The Jekris," *JAI*, XXVIII, 111-112. A British punitive expedition in 1897 razed the city and destroyed forever its power.
51. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 164.
52. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 273-275, 275 (quoted).
53. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 161-163, 171, 174, 175 (quoted), 185 ff., 195, 216, 220, 224-225, 291-293, Chap. XVI.
54. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 59. Cf. Thomson, "The Kalou-Vu of the Fijians," *JAI*, XXIV, 342.
55. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, III, 93-94; Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 484-485; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, III, 20, 21.
56. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 451; Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 106; Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 154; Best, "Maori Nomenclature," *JAI*, XXXII, 184.
57. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 201.
58. Watt, "Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 359. See also Hodson, "The Genna," *JAI*, XXXVI, 92-93; Hodson, "Native Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XXXI, 300, 302.
59. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 476; Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 192-194, 638, 649, 663, 668.
60. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 401-419; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 9.
61. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 50-53; Biart, *The Aztecs*, Chap. XIII.
62. Payne, *History of the New World*, II, 494; Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, I, Chaps. I, II.
63. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 479 (quoted), 480-481.
64. Markham, *The Incas of Peru*, pp. 78-95, 164-167; Cunow, *Inkareichs*, pp. 8-21, 51-52, 68-70; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 53-55; Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 197-198.
65. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 248-254, 252 (quoted), 282; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 78-81.
66. Geiger, *Ostiränische Kultur*, pp. 442 ff., 479.
67. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 515; Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, p. 273; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 523.
68. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, pp. 64, 81, 135; Crooke, "Rājputs and Maharrattas," *JAI*, XL, 39; Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, p. 273.
69. *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, Chaps. VII, VIII, 508-521; II, 40-45, 139 ff.; III, 93-98, 99 (quoted), 100-101; IV, Chap. I, 184-187, 190-191; Letourneau,

- "Le Passé et l'Avenir de la Guerre," *Revue de l'Ecole d'Anthropologie*, III, 271-272; Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 470; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 523; Douglas, "Social and Religious Ideas of the Chinese," *JAI*, XXII, 162-163; Pinches, "Early Inhabitants of Mesopotamia," *JAI*, XXI, 90.
70. Oppenheimer, *The State*, p. 172.
 71. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, I, 717.
 72. Oppenheimer, *The State*, pp. 16-17.
 73. Jenks, *State and Nation*, p. 130.
 74. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, I, 701.
 75. *Ibid.*, I, 716.
 76. *Ibid.*, I, 701.
 77. Oppenheimer, *The State*, p. 5.
 78. *Ibid.*, p. iv.
 79. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, I, 717.
 80. Cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 21; Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, Chap. II; Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 179-181; Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 49 ff.
 81. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 42, 179; Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 117; Lowie, *Primitive Culture*, pp. 68 ff.
 82. Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, I, 709.
 83. Cf. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 217-219. On the differentiation of classes and vocations, see Wundt, *Elements of Folk Psychology*, pp. 316-327.
 84. Dealey, *State and Government*, Chap. VI.

CHAPTER XIV

1. For general authors on the methods of primitive warfare, see Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 82-47; Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 358-368; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 223; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 27-133.
2. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 296.
3. Joshua 8. 3, 9-22; 10. 9; 11. 7; Judges 7. 19-22; 8. 11; 20. 29-34, 86-43; 60. 31-34, 42-44; II Chronicles 13. 13; II Samuel 2. 29, 32; 17. 22; Genesis 14. 15.
4. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 78.
5. Torday, *African Wilds*, p. 101; Hilton-Simpson, *The Kasai*, pp. 255-256; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 415-416.
6. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 435; XL, 412.
7. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 344-346.
8. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 60, 331, 339; III, 121; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 222-223, 328-348; Wake, "Australian Aborigines," *JAI*, I, 80; Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 92; Bonney, "Aborigines of Darling River," *JAI*, XIII, 136; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 32-33.
9. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 556-557; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 205-206; Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 78-79. The offender also stands trial by combat in the case of alleged murder by magic. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 154.
10. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 332; Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 77; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 32-33.
11. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 76.

12. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 368-369, 576.
13. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, VI, 699; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 145.
14. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 107.
15. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 105-106.
16. Breysig, *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*, I, 175-176.
17. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 145.
18. Keane, "The Botocudos," *JAI*, XIII, 207; Tylor, *Anthropology*, pp. 223-224.
19. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 165; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 579.
20. I Samuel 17.
21. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 79.
22. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-93.
23. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 94; cf. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 60.
24. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 346.
25. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 192-193.
26. Godwin-Austen, "Garo Hill Tribes," *JAI*, II, 394.
27. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, pp. 327, 328.
28. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 164.
29. Powers, *Tribes of California*, p. 160.
30. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 543, 581.
31. Numbers 21. 35; Deuteronomy 2. 32-34; 3. 8, 6; Joshua 6. 21; 8. 24, 26; 10. 28, 40; 11. 8, 10-12, 14; I Samuel 27. 8, 9; I Kings 11. 15, 16.
32. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-285.
33. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 199.
34. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
35. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 822.
36. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 862.
37. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 256.
38. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 182.
39. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 862; cf. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., II, 477.
40. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 346, 415.
41. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 195-196.
42. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 343-344.
43. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 126.
44. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 12-13, (12, note, quoted).
45. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 862-863.
46. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 294.
47. Burkhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 81, 173 (quoted).
48. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 362.
49. Cook "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth. N. S.*, II, 477.
50. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 198-199.
51. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 862.
52. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 296-297.
53. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, p. 226.
54. "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 375.
55. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 213.

56. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 345-347.
57. *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 156-157, 160 (quoted).
58. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 189.
59. For instances where poisoned weapons are commonly used and the poison carefully prepared, see Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 41; Champion, "The Atharaka," *JAI*, XLII, 90; Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 504; Angus, "Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 325; Conder, "Tribes in Bechuanaland," *JAI*, XVI, 89; Stow, *Native Tribes of South Africa*, pp. 63, 74; Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 6; Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, pp. 430-437; Tate, "The Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 136; Werner, *British Central Africa*, p. 187; Klose, *Togo*, pp. 302, 486; Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 172-173; Seligmann, "Kenyah Dart-Poison," *JAI*, XXXII, 239-243; Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 220; Waddell, "Poisoned Arrows of the Akas," *JAI*, XXIV, 57; St. John, "The Ainos," *JAI*, II, 250; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 915; White, "The Northwestern Provinces of South America," *JAI*, XIII, 251; Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 363; Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 266; XL, 101, 107; Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, I, 98, 103; II, 101, 127, 258, 316; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 221; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 18-19.
60. Pope-Hennessy, "The Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 26 (*Anthrop. Miscell.*).
61. Woodthorpe. "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 199.
62. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 201.
63. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 51.
64. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 298.
65. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 80, 174 (quoted).
66. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 198-199, 201 (quoted).
67. *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bombay*, I, 240, quoted by Sumner, *War*, p. 5.
68. *Iroquois Book of Rites*, p. 97.
69. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 200.
70. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 149-150.
71. Notice of declaration of war is carried to the enemy by them. See Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 256; II, 38; Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 323; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 333; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 156; Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 74.
72. Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 72; cf. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 678, 682; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 156, note.
73. Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 314-322; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 686, 691-710; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 72; Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 149-150; II, 477; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 181; Palmer, "Australian Tribes," *JAI*, XIII, 282.
74. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 688; Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 322.
75. Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 326.
76. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 74. Cf. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 149-150; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 181; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 687-690; Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 322; Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 63.
77. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.

78. Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia*, p. 334, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology* III, 16. Cf. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 328.
79. Albertis, *New Guinea*, I, 415.
80. Tremain, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 185.
81. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
82. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 178-179.
83. Holmes, "Art in Shell of the Ancient Americans," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, II, 241.
84. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 364, 365.
85. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 412 (quoted), 413-414.
86. Judges 20. 12; 21. 13; Joshua 22. 12-15; Luke 14. 31-32; I Kings 20. 17-18; II Kings 9. 19.
87. Keller, *Homer Society*, pp. 274-275 (quoted), 297.
88. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 215-222; and Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, § 72, for interesting and thorough treatments of this point.
89. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 329.
90. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 191.
91. Hilton-Simpson, *The Kasai*, p. 269.
92. Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 71.
93. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 12.
94. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 385-386.
95. Curr, *The Australian Race*, II, 293-294.
96. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 408.
97. Bastian, *Die Deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste*, I, 243.
98. Darwin, *Voyage of a Naturalist*, p. 236.
99. Biart, *The Aztecs*, p. 249; Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 425.
100. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 329.
101. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 363.
102. Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 360-361.
103. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 368 (quoted), 332; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 128; Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 360-361; McGuire, "Pipes and Smoking Customs," *Smithsonian Report, USNM* (1897), Pt. I, p. 631; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 189; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 364-366.
104. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 747.
105. Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 71.
106. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
107. French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 383.
108. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 61.
109. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, pp. 180-187.
110. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 97; Fison, "Land Tenure in Fiji," *JAI*, X, 344.
111. Krieger, *New-Guinea*, p. 824.
112. Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 251.
113. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 423, 424.
114. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 70.
115. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 344.

116. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 249.
117. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 723-735; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 97.
118. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 86; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 71, 75-76; Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 571.
119. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 297-298.
120. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 608-609.
121. March, "Mythology of Wise Birds," *JAI*, XXVII, 228.
122. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 884.
123. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 195.
124. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 752, 753, 794; Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 165; Tate, "The Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 265; Willoughby, "The Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 306.
125. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XX, 133; Hobley, "Kikuyu and Kamba Customs," *JAI*, XLI, 437. If a chief among the Bakongo gives a goat to the opposing chief, saying: "I do not want to fight," the latter must accept it, and peace is thus made. Weeks, *The Primitive Bakongo*, p. 194.
126. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 343, 344.
127. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 364.
128. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 198.
129. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, pp. 97-145.
130. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 17-18.
131. Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 251.
132. Forbes, "The Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 424.
133. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 37-38, 40.
134. Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 211.
135. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 249; Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 311.
136. Cook, "Aborigines of the Canary Islands," *Amer. Anth. N. S.*, II, 477.
137. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 164, 189, 269, 433-434, 500; Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 322, 368; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, pp. 128, 129, 134-138; Swanton, "The Tlingit Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 451; Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 360-361; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 40; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 864-866.
138. Holmes, "Art in Shell of the Ancient Americans," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, II, 241.
139. Tylor, "The Hale Series of Huron Wampum Belts," *JAI*, XXVI, 252-258. McGuire says that "the English were probably the first to use as a flag of truce the collar or belt of wampum, just as the French did the pipe. Later because of the want of a written language, both pipe and wampum belt seem to have been commonly employed as a reminder of agreements entered into between the whites and natives, a species of temporary ideograph, which after having answered the full purpose of one treaty or contract could later be used for another." "Pipes and Smoking Customs of the American Aborigines," *Smithsonian Report, USNM* (1897), Pt. I, p. 631.
140. Hale, "Four Huron Wampum Records," *JAI*, XXVI, 236-239, 242-246; Mallery, "Picture-Writing of American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 231.

141. The same was true in the case of the Homeric Greeks, among other people, where oath-ceremonies and sacrifices, together with invocation of the gods who were wont to punish oath-breakers, sanctioned reconciliations and truces. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 176 ff.
142. "Four Huron Wampum Records," *JAI*, XXVI, 241-242 (quoted), 242-245, 246 (quoted). Cf. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 6, note, 352-353.
143. Thomson, *The Fijians*, p. 305.
144. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 345.
145. Fletcher-La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVII, 603.
146. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 134; Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 433; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 416; Seligmann, *British New Guinea*, p. 319, note; Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 348; Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 213; Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVIII, Pt. I, p. 327. See chapters above on Cannibalism and Human Sacrifice.
147. Torday, *African Wilds*, p. 174; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289; Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 413; Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 822; Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 433; Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 214; Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVIII, Pt. I, p. 328; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 407; Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, pp. 288-289; Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-285; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 270-271; Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 293-294; Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 468; *Deuteronomy* 20. 10 ff. (laws respecting warfare among the Hebrews); Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 213-214; Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 7-71.
148. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 126.
149. Seligmann, *British New Guinea*, p. 319, note.
150. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXII, 60. Cf. Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, pp. 94-95.
151. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 214.
152. Man, "The Andaman Islands," *JAI*, XII, 355-356.
153. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 363.
154. Christison, "The Gauchos of San Jorge," *JAI*, XI, 36.
155. *Native Races*, I, 628.
156. Nieboer, *Slavery*, p. 192.
157. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 243; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 366; Nieboer, *Slavery*, p. 246 and note; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 500; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 82-83.
158. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 363.
159. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 456.
160. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 155.
161. Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XV, 237.
162. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, pp. 914-915.
163. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 314.
164. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, p. 223; Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 374.
165. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 193.

166. Dundas, "The Wawanga," *JAI*, XLIII, 51-52; Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 318-319; Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 220; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 278-279.
167. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-93; Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 14; Harper, "Totemism of the Gold Coast," *JAI*, XXXVI, 189; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 381; Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 332.
168. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 226; Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 414-415; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 413; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 195, 498; II, 746; Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 191, 294; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 618, 614.
169. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 132.
170. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 433.
171. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, pp. 146, 915; cf. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 366.
172. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 429, 430 (quoted); Biart, *The Aztecs*, pp. 164-165.
173. Oppenheimer, *The State*, p. 68.
174. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, II, Pt. IV, Chap. III; De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 190-191. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 62, thinks the word *servus* comes from *servare*, to preserve, and thus denotes humane thought rather than cruelty.
175. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 189.
176. Jones, *The Thlingets*, p. 113.
177. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 269.
178. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 191.
179. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 49.
180. De Beauvais, "Notice sur le Peuple de Benin," *Décade philosophique*, No. 12, Année 9, 1801, quoted by Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 103.
181. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 356 (quoted), 357 ff.
182. Nieboer, *Slavery*, Pt. II, Chaps. IV, V.
183. Morley, quoted by Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 254.

CHAPTER XV

1. Sumner, *War*, p. 13.
2. Tylor, "Remarks on Totemism," *JAI*, XXVIII, 148.
3. Tylor, "The Totem-Post from the Haida Village of Masset," *JAI*, XXVIII, 134. A case to the contrary is seen on the Gold Coast of Africa, where "a man cannot visit with safety a member of the same totem of a non-friendly tribe." Van Hieu, "Totemism of the Gold Coast," *JAI*, XXXVI, 188.
4. "Marriage and Descent," *JAI*, XVIII, 267-268.
5. "The Matriarchal Family System," *The Nineteenth Century*, XL, 93.
6. "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 281.
7. Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 316.
8. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 185.
9. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 266.
10. Forbes, "The Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 425.
11. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 13, 21 (quoted).

12. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 344.
13. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 185 (quoted), 186 (quoted), 678 (quoted), 682-683; "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 72-73. Cf. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 165 note.
14. Letourneau, *L'Evolution du Commerce*, has collected many instances of *commercium*.
15. Very frequently among primitive peoples the desired articles are weapons, and through trade and barter superior weapons are obtained. As cases of this see Simson, "The Piojés," *JAI*, VIII, 21; Simson, "The Jívaros," *JAI*, IX, 390; Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 123; Haddon, "Stone Clubs of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXX, 242; Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 39; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 297; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, §§ 75-79.
16. See Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, pp. 192, 311.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 195.
18. Turner, "The Motu," *JAI*, VII, 473.
19. Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 77-78; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 710-712.
20. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 181.
21. Simson, "The Napo Indians," *JAI*, XII, 25 ff.
22. Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, pp. 195-196.
23. "The Kubus of Sumatra," *JAI*, XIV, 122.
24. Jenks, *State and Nation*, pp. 105-106.
25. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 376.
26. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 77.
27. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 311-312.
28. Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, p. 195.
29. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 620-625.
30. Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, Chap. XII; Robinson, "War and Economics," *Pol. Sci. Quart.*, XV, 586-588.
31. *Faust*, ii, 6574-5.
32. Keller, *Colonization*, p. 34.
33. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 92-93.
34. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 229.
35. *The Australian Race*, I, 77.
36. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 446.
37. Sumner, *War*, pp. 21-22.
38. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 10.
39. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, p. 96.
40. Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, Chap. XIII.
41. Keller, *Colonization*, pp. 38-39.
42. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 322.
43. Forbes, "The Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 423.
44. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 447.
45. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 62-64.
46. Price, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, I, 186.

47. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 236; Waitz, *Anthropology*, III, 338.
48. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 106 (quoted), 107-108; cf. his "Secret Associations in Australia and Melanesia," *JAI*, XLI, 482-483. See also Rivers, *Social Organization*, Chap. VII.
49. Webster, "Secret Associations in Australia and Melanesia," *JAI*, XLI, 482. Cf. his *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 106-107.
50. *West African Studies*, p. 448. Cf. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 115-118.
51. *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 381-382.
52. Quoted by Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, pp. 145-146.
53. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, p. 93.
54. Von Pfeil, "Duk Duk," *JAI*, XXVII, 186.
55. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 189.
56. "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 7.
57. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, p. 107.
58. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 145.
59. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, p. 389.
60. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, p. 141.
61. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, p. 107.
62. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 72; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 84-85; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, II, 292; Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 61-63; Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 378. For instances of peace being enjoined at initiation ceremonies, see Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 185-186; Matthews, "The Boro," *JAI*, XXIV, 421-427, "The Bürbüng," *JAI*, XXV, 310 ff., and "The Keeparra Ceremony," *JAI*, XXVI, 320 ff.
63. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 341.
64. Dundas, "Tribes of Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 54.
65. Danks, "Shell-Money of New Britain," *JAI*, XVII, 310, 314.
66. "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 429-430.
67. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254.
68. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 363.
69. Forbes, "The Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 412; Dundas, "The Wawanga," *JAI*, XLIII, 51-52; Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa*, pp. 318-319; Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 220. See Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 278-279; II, 99 ff., for a fuller treatment of this subject.
70. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 135.
71. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 29-30.
72. Thomson, "The Kalou-Vu of the Fijians," *JAI*, XXIV, 342. See Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, Pt. VI, Chap. IX, for similar cases.
73. Cf. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 99-101, 105, 150-152.
74. Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, I, 114.
75. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 99, 100.
76. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 84.
77. Sumner, *War*, p. 21.
78. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 555 ff.; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 99.
79. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 174.
80. *The Bedouins*, pp. 84-85, 174-175.

81. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 212-213; Hobley, "Kikuyu and Kamba Religious Beliefs," *JAI*, XLI, 426; Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 40; Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, V, 16.
82. For cases to support these facts, see Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 373; Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs," *JAI*, XL, 428, 429, 432, 438-439; Bros, *La Religion des Peuples non-civilisés*, p. 98; Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 50; Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 308; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 50-51; Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 235; O'Sullivan, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XL, 176-177, 189-190; Solomon, "Diaries Kept in Car Nicobar," *JAI*, XXXII, 233; Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 78.
83. See Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 432; XL, 363-364; Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 259; Moggridge, "The Nyassaland Tribes," *JAI*, XXXII, 470-472; Johnstone, "Mombasa Sub-District," *JAI*, XXXII, 269; Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 68; Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 115; Willoughby, "The Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 310; Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 377-378; Parkinson, "Efik and Ekoi Tribes," *JAI*, XXXVII, 267; Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 320; Garbutt, "Witchcraft and Superstition," *JAI*, XXXIX, 555-556; Sheane, "Awemba Religion," *JAI*, XXXVI, 156-157; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 399-400, 416-417, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 48-49, and "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 151; Furness, "Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 464-465; Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, p. 69; Wines, *Punishment and Reformation*, pp. 45-47.
84. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, VI, 582.
85. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 140.
86. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, pp. 20-21.
87. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, pp. 112-113.
88. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 352-353.
89. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 386 (quoted), 409.
90. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 514-515.
91. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 174-175.
92. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 178, 333 ff., 342, 347; Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 70.
93. Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 65.
94. Durham, "Montenegrin Manners and Customs," *JAI*, XXXIX, 89, 91.
95. *Anthropology*, p. 424.
96. See Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 325-458, who has fully developed this subject.
97. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 432, 444 (quoted), 447; XL, 360-361; Weeks, *Congo Life and Folklore*, p. 222.
98. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 409, 415, 416; Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, pp. 73, 186.
99. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 68.
100. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 117.
101. Barrett, "The Wa-Giriana," *JAI*, XLI, 84-85.
102. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, II, 143-144; Johnstone, "Mombasa Sub-District," *JAI*, XXXII, 268; Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 176; Cole, "The Wagogo," *JAI*, XXXII, 321; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 334; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 408-409.

103. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 526, 547.
104. *Missionary Travels*, p. 489.
105. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 834, 839.
106. *Globus*, I, 132 ff., quoted by Lippert, *op. cit.*, 834.
107. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 183, 185.
108. Forbes, "The Island of Timor," *JAI*, XIII, 423, 425.
109. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 194.
110. Hodson, "The Genna," *JAI*, XXXVI, 99.
111. Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 642.
112. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 50-51.
113. Exodus 14. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 818.
114. Schrader, *Aryan Peoples*, p. 397.
115. Keller, *Homer Society*, pp. 176, 178, 800, 306.
116. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 334-335, 337-338.
117. Cf. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 417; Wines, *Punishment and Reformation*, Chaps. III, IV.
118. This is the case in South and West Africa particularly. See Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XX, 108, 109; Klose, *Togo*, pp. 277, 505; Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 191, 301-302.
119. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 507-508; Sumner, *War*, pp. 21-23; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 578 ff.; Wines, *Punishment and Reformation*, Chaps. III, IV; Jenks, *State and Nation*, pp. 80-88.
120. Tylor, *Anthropology*, pp. 418-419; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 502, 505; Schrader, *Aryan Peoples*, p. 397; Geiger, *Ostiränische Kultur*, p. 453; Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 84, 87, 178-179; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9; Durham, "Montenegrin Manners and Customs," *JAI*, XXXIX, 86, 89, 91.
121. For ethnographical references of the practice of *wergeld* as a means of settling blood feuds and preventing murder and war, see the following: *Africa*: Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 262-263; II, 54, 151, 156, 157; Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, pp. 19-20; Klose, *Togo*, pp. 277, 505; Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 301; Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 191, 301-302; Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 219; and the following pages in the *JAI*: XX, 119; XXII, 108, 109; XXIX, 233, 238-239; XXXII, 268, 271-272, 314; XXXIV, 132, 156; XXXVI, 288-289; XXXVII, 112; XXXIX, 194-195, 433; XL, 189-190, 290, 438-439; XLI, 25, 34, 422-423, 426; XLII, 85; XLIII, 52, 70, 512-514, 539, 545. *India*: Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 173; Woodthorpe, "Hill Tribes on the Mekong," *JAI*, XXVI, 21; Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 205-206; St. John, "Hill Tribes of North Aracan," *JAI*, II, 240. *Australia and the Islands*: Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 328, 715, 718; Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 189, 325-326; Brinton, *Ethnography*, I, 206. *America*: Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 168, 348; Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Am. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 369; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 381-383; Powers, *California Indians*, p. 21; Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 356. *Advanced Peoples*: Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 72-73, 108; Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 84, 178-179; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 9; Geiger, *Ostiränische Kultur*, pp. 452-453; Schrader, *Aryan*

- Peoples*, pp. 397 ff.; Kovalevsky, "Lex Barbarorum," *JAI*, XXV, 115; Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 282-286; Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 502-503, 505; Durham, "Some Montenegrin Manners and Customs," *JAI*, XXXIX, 86, 89, 91.
122. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, pp. 116-117; Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 295.
123. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 354. Guest-friendship also prevails in parts of Brazil. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, II, 182.
124. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 446.
125. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 175; Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 363; Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 222.
126. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 306 (quoted), 307, 309, 310 (quoted).
127. Smith, *Early Arabia*, p. 41.
128. *The Bedouins*, pp. 100, 102 (quoted), 192 (quoted), 194 (quoted), 319.
129. Harris, "The Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 71-72; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 10.
130. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 555 ff. He has given an interesting treatment of the growth of the peace-group by social and political amalgamation. It represents, in a word, the growth of the in-group.
131. For outstanding cases of savage alliances produced by war, see Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 330; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 580, 621; Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 246; Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 362; Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 335; Ward, "Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 290-291; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 49; Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 136, 449; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 416; Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 89-90; Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 110.
132. "Four Huron Wampum Records," *JAI*, XXVI, 226-227.
133. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 449-451.
134. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois*, pp. 91, 190; Hale, "Four Huron Wampum Records," *JAI*, XXVI, 226-227; Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 421-427, 449-451.
135. Sumner, *War*, p. 23.
136. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 503 ff.; *War*, p. 23.

CHAPTER XVI

1. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 328; Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 146-148, 154-155, 216-223.
2. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 358.
3. Holmes, "Natives of the Papuan Gulf," *JAI*, XXXII, 422; see also Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 141; Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 11.
4. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 62.
5. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 126.
6. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 173.
7. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 368.
8. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 308; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 686-692, 722.
9. Sumner, *War*, pp. 93-94.

10. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, III, 53, 54, 59 ff.
11. Whitnall, "In Defense of the Cave-Man," *Scientific Monthly* (June, 1926), p. 525.
12. "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 127-128.
13. Petrie, "Migrations," *JAI*, XXXVI, 189-232; Johnston, "Ethnography of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 375-421; Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 58; Holmes, "The Elema Tribe," *JAI*, XXXIII, 125-134; Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, pp. 380-381.
14. Holmes, *The Trend of the Race*, p. 250.
15. "Migrations," *JAI*, XXXVI, 190.
16. *Social Origins*, pp. 10-11.
17. MacIver, *Community*, p. 262. Extensive mixture has occurred especially in open countries like Babylonia; see Tucker and Myers, "Anthropology of the Sudan," *JAI*, XL, 141; Bertin, "Races of the Babylonian Empire," *JAI*, XVIII, 104; Petrie, "The Races of Early Egypt," *JAI*, XXXI, 250-255; MacIver, "Anthropometrical Work in Egypt," *JAI*, XXX, 103; Petrie, "Migrations," *JAI*, XXXVI, 190; Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 39-40; Holland, "Contact-Metamorphism," *JAI*, XXXII, 96-123.
18. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 27; Lowie, *Primitive Society*, pp. 8-12.
19. *Man and Culture*, pp. 42 (quoted), 173-180.
20. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 219-230. He has given an interesting treatment of this point with a few illustrations. For other cases see Johnston, "Ethnography of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 375-421; Barrett, "The Wagiriama," *JAI*, XLI, 29; Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 44; Frere, "Relations between Civilized and Savage Life," *JAI*, XI, 315-318; Crooke, "Rājputs and Mahrattas," *JAI*, XL, 41, 47; Holland, "Contact-Metamorphism," *JAI*, XXXII, 96-123.
21. Hollis, "History of Vumba," *JAI*, XXX, 282.
22. *Geographia*, xl. 11. 8.
23. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 865.
24. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 198-199.
25. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 835 (quoted), 836-844.
26. See Frere, "Relations between Civilized and Savage Life," *JAI*, XI, 317-318; *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 232 ff., 311 ff.
27. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 21.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 243. Cf. Gregory, Keller, and Bishop, *Physical and Commercial Geography*, pp. 231, 235-237.
29. Angus, "Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 317.
30. Saunderson, "Corea and Its People," *JAI*, XXIV, 302.
31. Kerry-Nicholls, "Origin of the Maori Race," *JAI*, XV, 196.
32. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 189.
33. *The Fijians*, p. 87. Cf. Novicow, *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, Chaps. I, VII, VIII, who maintains that war has always produced selection for the worse, not for the better.
34. Sumner, *War*, pp. 15-16, once said: "There can be no doubt that the Germans of today owe their preëminence in industry and science to the fact that they are a highly disciplined nation." Cf. Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 174, 242; Ross, *Social Control*, pp. 50, 396.

35. The implements of primitive man show progressively how one contrivance may serve for other purposes. Cf. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 186; Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, I, 286-287.
36. *Principles of Sociology*, I, 60 ff.
37. Mortillet, *Le Préhistorique*, p. 226; Lawes, "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 373; Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 400; Griesbach, "Weapons," *JAI*, I, cliv; Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XX, 184; Ward, "Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 297; Johnstone, "Mombasa Sub-District," *JAI*, XXXII, 270; Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 286; Champion, "The Atharaka," *JAI*, XLII, 77-78; Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 242; Frič and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 400; Mason, *Origins of Invention*, Chap. X; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, pp. 32-42.
38. Kubary, *Karolinen-Archipels*, pp. 155, 292; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 35.
39. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 123.
40. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 310.
41. Haddon, "Stone Clubs of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXX, 242.
42. Godwin-Austen, "Gäro Hill Tribes," *JAI*, I, 392-393.
43. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 14.
44. Shelford, "Swords of the Sarawak Tribes," *JAI*, XXXI, 219-226.
45. Sumner, *The Challenge of Facts*, p. 153; Sumner, *War*, p. 30.
46. *Evolution and Significance of the Public Health Campaign*, pp. 59-60 (quoted); Winslow, *Man and the Microbe*, p. 56; Moore, *Public Health in the United States*, pp. 87, 96-97.
47. Harrington, "Poison Gas Fumes," *New York Times*, June 3, 1923.
48. For instances of persons being enslaved for such reasons, see Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 427-428; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 408, 411; Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 175; Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 289, 290; Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, p. 218; Bastian, *Die deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste*, I, 180; Dale, "The Bondei Country," *JAI*, XXV, 230; DeCrespigny, "The Milanows of Borneo," *JAI*, V, 34; Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 374; Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 203; Thurston, *Southern India*, pp. 441-442; Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 217; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, Pt. VIII, Chap. XV; Nieboer, *Slavery*, pp. 428-430; Sumner and Keller, *Science of Society*, Chap. X.
49. Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 164; Tourmagne, *Histoire de l'Esclavage*, p. 4.
50. Nieboer, *Slavery*, p. 7.
51. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, III, 473-474.
52. Gumpłowicz, *Der Rassenkampf*, pp. 207-219, 230-238; Frere, "Relations between Civilized and Savage Life," *JAI*, XI, 314-315; Wundt, *Elements of Folk Psychology*, pp. 316-327.
53. Dealey, *State and Government*, p. 113.
54. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 520-525, 541, 557-564, 565, 574, 579, 761; Sumner, *War*, p. 213.
55. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 359.
56. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, p. 164; Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 45, 676-677.
57. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, p. 56.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.
59. Keller, *Through War to Peace*, p. 181, Chap. XIII.
60. *War*, pp. 16, 32, 33.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
62. Cf. Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 66-89.
63. Sumner, *War*, p. 31.
64. *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, pp. 216-217.
65. Cox, *Problem of Population*, pp. 84, 85, 107 (quoted).
66. Cf. Carr-Saunders, *The Population Problem*, p. 379; Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 81-83. Among more advanced peoples it would seem that from a physiological point of view war has not contributed to the improvement of the race. In modern society it is probably dysgenic. Novicow, *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, pp. 20, 25-26; Keller, *Societal Evolution*, pp. 171-172; Cox, *Problem of Population*, p. 188; Ross, *Principles of Sociology*, pp. 386-387.
67. Novicow, *War and Its Alleged Benefits*, pp. 78-79, Chap. I.
68. For the contrast of industrialism and militancy, see Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 546, 574, 598-600; Sumner, *War*, pp. 323-324, 348; Sumner, *Earth Hunger*, pp. 190-191; Sumner, *The Challenge of Facts*, pp. 300-301.
69. Giddings, *Studies in the Theory of Human Society*, p. 214, summarizing Bagehot's *Physics and Politics*.

REFERENCES TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1. Montefiore, "Notes on the Samoyads," *JAI*, XXIV, 392.
2. Hiekisch, *Tungusen*, p. 48, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14.
3. Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, pp. 281-282; Hopkins, *History of Religions*, p. 46.
4. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 41.
5. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 187 and note.
6. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 41.
7. Knocker, "Wild Tribes of the Ulu Plus," *JAI*, XXXIX, 144, 147.
8. Fawcett, "The Kondayamkottai Maravas," *JAI*, XXXIII, 57, note.
9. *The Todas*, p. 28.
10. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 256.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Missionary Travels*, pp. 200, 201.
13. Havemeyer and Keller, *Ethnography*, p. 8.
14. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 359.
15. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 25.
16. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14; Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, Pt. I, Chap. XX.
17. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 256.
18. Turner, "Ethnology of the Ungara District," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 189.
19. Grinnell, *The Indians of To-day*, p. 55.
20. Fries, *Grönland*, p. 139, quoted by Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 14.
21. Jetté, "Medicine-Men of the Ten'a," *JAI*, XXXVII, 157.
22. *The Indians of To-day*, pp. 51, 52 (quoted), 65, 69, 256.
23. Mooney, "The Kiowa Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XVII, Pt. I, p. 152; cf. *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XIV, 1078.
24. Grinnell, *The Indians of To-day*, pp. 13, 250.
25. McGee, "Seri Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XIV, Pt. I, 154.
26. Von Martius, *Ethnographie Brasiliens*, p. 51.
27. Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 49.
28. Markham, *Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon*, *JAI*, XL, 110; XXIV, 279.

APPENDIX B

1. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 34-35, 37.
2. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 264 (quoted), 270; XL, 130.
3. Wickham, "The Soumoo or Woolwa Indians," *JAI*, XXIV, 201.
4. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 579-580.
5. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 80, Pt. II, p. 146.
6. Told by an Indian to Tout, "The Stseetis," *JAI*, XXXIV, 316.
7. *Missionary Travels*, pp. 146-147.

8. Willoughby, "Initiation Ceremonies of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXIX, 233 (quoted), 285-286.
9. *Travels in West Africa*, p. 531.
10. Bagge, "The Circumcision Ceremony among the Naivasha Masai," *JAI*, XXXIV, 169.
11. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 359-360, 405. In Borneo, "both men and women of several tribes will test their bravery and indifference to pain by setting fire to a row of small pieces of tinder placed along the forearm, and the scars caused by these burns are often permanent." Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 64. These scars should not be mistaken for decorative designs.
12. Mathews, "The Bora," *JAI*, XXIV, 423.
13. Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 82.
14. Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 125. Cf. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 83-84, for ordeals in the initiation ceremonies of Australians in general.
15. Harris, *Highlands of Ethiopia*, III, 58, quoted by Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 124-125.
16. Willoughby, "Initiation Ceremonies of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXIX, 234.
17. Crawley, "Sexual Taboo," *JAI*, XXIV, 124, 431; Gason, "Of the Tribes, Dieyeri, etc.," *JAI*, XXIV, 168; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 82.
18. Dorsey, "Siouan Cults," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 444-446.
19. Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 86.
20. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 471.
21. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 414-415.
22. See Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, I, Chap. XL; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, *passim*.
23. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 420.
24. Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 123.
25. "Initiation Ceremonies of Natives of the Papuan Gulf," *JAI*, XXXII, 424.
26. Frič and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 387. This represents what Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, I, 52-219, calls sympathetic magic. He gives an excellent treatment of the subject.
27. Dorsey, "Siouan Cults," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 444-445.
28. Fletcher, "Significance of the Scalp-Lock," *JAI*, XXVII, 443, 446, 449-450.
29. Cf. Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 40-43.
30. Dundas, "The Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 67.
31. Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 285.
32. Wheelwright, "Native Circumcision Lodges," *JAI*, XXXV, 253.
33. Willoughby, "Initiation Ceremonies of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXIX, 231.
34. Mathews, "The Bürbüng," *JAI*, XXV, 311; Mathews, "The Keepana Ceremony," *JAI*, XXVI, 320 ff. Cf. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 339-345, who develops the idea that the second naming of the boy at initiation time signifies also the transition from the mother-family to the father-family. This is borne out by the fact mentioned above that the initiatory rites are usually begun by the surrender of the boys by the women; they are now to enter the men's circle. Lippert further develops the connection of this change in status with the cult, showing how the boys are really initiated into the cult-bond of the men.

35. Wissler, *Man and Culture*, pp. 278-280, from the behaviorist standpoint, refers to it as the "conditioning response,"—a process by which the individual learns to do the things the other members of the tribe do.
36. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 372.
37. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 185.
38. Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 299.
39. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 100-101.
40. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 146-147.
41. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 269.
42. "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 207.
43. Holmes, "Natives of the Papuan Gulf," *JAI*, XXXII, 422.
44. Robertson, "Káfiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 78-79.
45. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 638, Chaps. IX, X.
46. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 81.
47. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 580.
48. Related by the Rev. Padre Pozzi, who had resided as a missionary among these Indians for some years, to Simson, "The Jívaros and Canelos Indians," *JAI*, IX, 388.

APPENDIX C

1. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 107.
2. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 145.
3. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, VI, 465, 699.
4. Breysig, *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*, p. 191.
5. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 235-236, 269, 379.
6. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 202.
7. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 740, 745, 746.
8. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254, 255.
9. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 108.
10. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 190.
11. "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 505. Among the Hottentots also, war was not a serious affair. Kolben, *Present State of the Cape of Good Hope*, I, 286, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, IV, 12.
12. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 416.
13. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 218.
14. Brinton, *Ethnography*, I, Pt. III, p. 206.
15. Elton, "Natives of the Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XVII, 98.
16. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 85, 86.
17. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 295.
18. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267-268.
19. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 296.
20. *Samoa*, p. 192.
21. "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 142-143.
22. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 338.
23. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 85, 86.
24. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 133.
25. *The Euahlayi Tribe*, pp. 133-134. Foelsche, "Some Tribes of the Aborigines," *JAI*, XXIV, 196, inspector of police at Port Darwin, has related the

- incidents of a fight he witnessed, which are typical of the North Australians in general and very similar to the case already mentioned.
26. Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 571-576.
 27. *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 489-490.
 28. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 77.
 29. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 32, note, 154-156, 157-158.
 30. *Ibid.*, I, 158-160.
 31. Quoted by Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 617-618; see also 559-560, 579-581.
 32. Keller, *Homeric Society*, p. 295.
 33. I Samuel 17. 8-10, 16, 23, 25-27, 49; cf. II Samuel 2. 21.
 34. *History*, IX, 26.
 35. Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, I, 24 ff.
 36. Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, pp. 581-582.
 37. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 76, 81, 167, 174, 175.

APPENDIX D

1. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 188-189, 215, 542, 579.
2. Cremony, *Life Among the Apaches*, pp. 44, 193 ff.
3. Swanton, "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 48, p. 126.
4. White, "The Northwestern Provinces of South America," *JAI*, XIII, 241, 244, 246.
5. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 241-284; XL, 73-140.
6. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 195. Cf. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, II, 143; Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, II.
7. "The Gauchos of San Jorge," *JAI*, XI, 44-45.
8. Simson, "The Jívaros and Canelos Indians," *JAI*, IX, 385.
9. Frič and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 382.
10. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 225.
11. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 334, 354.
12. Musters, "Races of Patagonia," *JAI*, I, 196.
13. De Crespigny, "Milanows of Borneo," *JAI*, V, 34.
14. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 174.
15. *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 97.
16. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 492.
17. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 192.
18. Semon, *Im australischen Busch*, pp. 318, 371-372.
19. Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 265-266.
20. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 413-415.
21. Turner, "The Motu," *JAI*, VII, 493.
22. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
23. Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 19.
24. Christian, "Micronesian Weapons," *JAI*, XXVIII, 289.
25. Christian, *The Caroline Islands*, pp. 18, 23, 116-118, 211.
26. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, p. 322.
27. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.

28. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 189-190.
29. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 268.
30. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 192. Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 187.
31. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267.
32. Philippi, "Easter Island," *JAI*, V, 112.
33. Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, pp. 19, 60, 79, 83, 94.
34. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 346.
35. Related by the Rev. Bulmer to Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 130.
36. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 244. Personal, tribal, and topographical names, among the Maoris, are derived chiefly from war and its events. Best, "Maori Nomenclature," *JAI*, XXXII, 183-184, 194, 196, 197. Cf. Hopley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 353.
37. Pennefather, "Natives of New Zealand," *JAI*, XVI, 212.
38. Petrie, "Races of Early Egypt," *JAI*, XXXI, 248-255; Tomkins, "The Hyksôs," *JAI*, XIX, 183-198.
39. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 283-285.
40. Von Kremer, *Kulturgeschichte des Orients*, I, Chap. VI.
41. Judges 12. 4; I Samuel 14. 16, 20; II Chronicles 20. 23; Jeremiah 40. 9; 46. 12; Psalms 18. 40, 42.
42. Keller, *Homeric Society*, pp. 92, 297; Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, p. 559.
43. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 202-212.
44. Harris, "Berbers of Morocco," *JAI*, XXVII, 64, 70; Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 2-3, 7-8 quoted.
45. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 76, 165-166, 311.
46. Sykes, "The Kurdish Tribes," *JAI*, XXXVIII, 455-482.
47. Durham, "High Albania," *JAI*, XL, 462.

APPENDIX E

1. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 109.
2. *Ibid.*, I, 254.
3. Cummins, "The Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas," *JAI*, XXXIV, 149, 152.
4. Tucker and Myers, "Anthropology of the Sudan," *JAI*, XL, 141.
5. "A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 316.
6. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 190.
7. Hore, "The Twelve Tribes of Tanganyika," *JAI*, XII, 3, 5-6.
8. French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 380.
9. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 800, 802.
10. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 13.
11. Tate, "The Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes," *JAI*, XXXIV, 131.
12. French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 364.
13. Tate, "The Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes," *JAI*, XXXIV, 131; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 255.
14. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 542.
15. Steere, "East African Tribes," *JAI*, I, cxlix.
16. Dundas, "The Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 56-58.

17. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 38-40.
18. Stigand, "Natives of Nyassaland," *JAI*, XXXVII, 125-127.
19. Mullens, "Peoples of Madagascar," *JAI*, V, 189.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 183.
21. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XX, 113 ff.; Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal*, Chaps. VIII, IX, X. The organization of the Zulu army will be considered later.
22. Conder, "Native Tribes in Bechuanaland," *JAI*, XVI, 88.
23. Champion, "The Atharaka," *JAI*, XLII, 69.
24. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 365-367.
25. Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 38, 40.
26. Granville, Roth, and Roth, "The Jekris," *JAI*, XXVIII, 117.
27. Clarke, "Culture of the Ashantees," *JAI*, IV, 123.
28. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 278-279.
29. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 182-183, 189-190.
30. Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 126; Read and Dalton, "Works of Art from Benin City," *JAI*, XXVII, 362 ff.

APPENDIX F

1. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, p. 328.
2. Jones, *The Thlingets of Alaska*, pp. 112-118.
3. Tout, "Tribes of Vancouver Island," *JAI*, XXXVII, 372-374.
4. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 215.
5. "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914. Cf. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 188.
6. *The Aztecs*, Chap. VIII.
7. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 763.
8. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 267; XL, 105, 107, 124.
9. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 195.
10. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 224.
11. Simson, "The Jívaros and Canelos Indians," *JAI*, IX, 385.
12. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 334.
13. Simson, "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 505.
14. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254, 256, 257.
15. "Notes on the Galla," *JAI*, XXX, 51.
16. *Journey of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile*, quoted by Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 111.
17. "Anthropology of Africa," *JAI*, VI, 169.
18. Mungo Park, *Travels in the Interior of Africa*, p. 87, Chap. VIII; Cameron, *Across Africa*, pp. 278-279, quoted by Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 111.
19. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, II, 592.
20. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 334; Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 822.
21. Dundas, "The Baringo District," *JAI*, XL, 50-52, 56-58, 79.

22. Steere, "East African Tribes," *JAI*, I, cxliv.
23. Champion, "The Atharaka," *JAI*, XLII, 69-70.
24. Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 285.
25. Stigand, "Natives of Nyassaland," *JAI*, XXXVII, 125-127; Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 35-36, 39-40.
26. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 4-5.
27. Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 295.
28. Livingstone, *Second Journey*, p. 397, quoted by Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 111.
29. Johnston, "Ethnography of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 408-409; Shooter, *Kafirs of Natal*, Chaps. VIII, IX, X; Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XX, 113 ff.
30. Holub, "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 4-5.
31. Stow, *Native Races of South Africa*, pp. 233 (quoted), 235, Chap. XIII.
32. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 190.
33. "Central South African Tribes," *JAI*, X, 5.
34. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 365-367, 371 (quoted).
35. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 398-400, 415-416 (quoted), 420.
36. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 40.
37. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
38. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 142-143, 145, 146-147.
39. Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 44.
40. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 174.
41. *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 189-190, 293.
42. Roth, *Great Benin*, pp. 68-84, 126.
43. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 161-162, 163 (quoted), 167, 180-181; XXVII, 12, 41; Watt, "Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 358; Peal, "The Morong," *JAI*, XXII, 247, 248; Furness, "The Nagas of Eastern Assam," *JAI*, XXXII, 446.
44. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 228.
45. Knocker, "Aborigines of Sungei Ujong," *JAI*, XXXVII, 291-292.
46. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 97.
47. Hose, "Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXIII, 157.
48. St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East*, II, 29, quoted by Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 111.
49. Hose and Shelford, "Tatu in Borneo," *JAI*, XXXVI, 60.
50. Albertis, *New Guinea*, I, 390.
51. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, 414; Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 261-263.
52. Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 265-266.
53. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
54. Hardy and Elkington, *Savage South Seas*, p. 97.
55. Woodford, "Canoes of the British Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XXXIX, 510.
56. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 391, 398-400.
57. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, p. 322.
58. Whitmee, "Ethnology of Polynesia," *JAI*, VIII, 267; Philippi, "Easter Island," *JAI*, V, 112; Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 187.
59. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 194.

60. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 297.
61. Batchelor, *The Ainu of Japan*, pp. 284, 286, 288-289.
62. Calder, "Native Tribes of Tasmania," *JAI*, III, 7-8, 24 (quoted). On the other hand, de Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 366, thinks the Tasmanians were not very warlike until the whites tried to exterminate them.
63. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 366.
64. "Aborigines of the North Coast," *JAI*, VII, 266.
65. Dieffenbach, *Travels in New Zealand*, quoted by Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 111.
66. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 368.

APPENDIX G

1. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 254.
2. Pope-Hennessy, "Notes on the Jukos," *JAI*, XXX, 24 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
3. Elliot, "Native West African Customs," *JAI*, XXIII, 82.
4. Hore, "Twelve Tribes of Tanganyika," *JAI*, XII, 8.
5. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, II, 800.
6. French-Sheldon, "Natives of East Africa," *JAI*, XXI, 380; Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 347.
7. Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 232, 238.
8. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 35-36; Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 285; Johnston, "Ethnography of Africa," *JAI*, XLIII, 408-409.
9. Monteiro, "The Quissama Tribe," *JAI*, V, 199; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 399.
10. Gottschling, "The Bawenda," *JAI*, XXXV, 371; Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 190; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 49; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 415.
11. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 414.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 415.
13. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 413.
14. Klose, *Togo*, p. 502.
15. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 188, 189-190, 197.
16. Roth, *Great Benin*, p. 126.
17. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 40.
18. *Journ. Asiatic Society of Bengal*, VIII, 188, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, V, 17. Cf. Holdich, "Swatis and Afridis," *JAI*, XXIX, 5, 6.
19. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 227.
20. Turner, "Ethnology of the Motu," *JAI*, VII, 492; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 414-415. Theft is a common cause of war here.
21. Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 96.
22. Ribbe, *Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen*, pp. 75, 322.
23. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
24. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 84, 86.
25. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 196.
26. Jones, *The Thlingets of Alaska*, p. 112.

27. Allison, "The Similkameen Indians," *JAI*, XXI, 317.
28. Tout, "The Siciatl of British Columbia," *JAI*, XXXIV, 29-30.
29. *Native Races*, I, 407.
30. *Life among the Apaches*, p. 44. Russell, "The Pima Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 203.
31. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 225.
32. Latham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 354.
33. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 224. Simson, "The Záparos," *JAI*, VII, 504-505.

APPENDIX H

1. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 262-263.
2. *Ibid.*, II, 54.
3. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 108.
4. Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 62-63.
5. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, II, 743.
6. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 357-358.
7. Hobley, "Kikuyu and Kamba Religious Beliefs," *JAI*, XLI, 426. Cf. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, p. 219; Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs," *JAI*, XL, 438.
8. Barrett, "The Wa-Giriama," *JAI*, XLI, 25 (quoted), 34.
9. Cole, "The Wagogo," *JAI*, XXXII, 314.
10. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 194-195.
11. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 99, 112.
12. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 412 (quoted), 416; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 289.
13. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 48.
14. Torday and Joyce, "The S. W. Congo Free State," *JAI*, XXXVII, 140.
15. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 133, 431-433; XL, 399-400.
16. Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa*, pp. 19-20.
17. O'Sullivan, "Dinka Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XL, 176-177, 189-190.
18. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 185-186.
19. Klose, *Togo*, pp. 277, 505.
20. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 24, 25 (quoted), 45.
21. Woodthorpe, "The Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 67.
22. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 23; XXVI, 161-162; Peal, "Nagas," *JAI*, III, 478.
23. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 174, 195 (quoted).
24. Watt, "Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 354-355.
25. Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 382.
26. Godwin-Austen, "Garó Hill Tribes," *JAI*, II, 394.
27. Carey and Tuck, *The Chin Hills*, I, 205-206, 227 (quoted).
28. Risley, *Ethnography of India*, pp. 67, 71.
29. Brinton, *Ethnography*, I, Pt. III, p. 206.
30. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 450.
31. Furness, *Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters*, p. 69; Roth, *Natives of Sarawak*, II, 96; Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 174.
32. Sarasin, *Die Weddas von Ceylon*, p. 539.

33. Man, "The Andaman Islands," *JAI*, XII, 110.
34. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 199, 318; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 37; Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 212-213.
35. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 314 (quoted), 346.
36. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXIII, 385; Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 326-327; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 37.
37. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 393.
38. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 293.
39. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 91-92, 178, 189.
40. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 105-106, 115 (quoted); *The Maori Race*, p. 366.
41. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 241.
42. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, p. 325; de Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 458.
43. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, p. 244.
44. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 105.
45. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, pp. 241, 244 (quoted).
46. *The Maori Race*, p. 326.
47. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 111; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 160.
48. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 70; cf. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 156-157, 216-217, 221.
49. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 71.
50. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 122-123.
51. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, pp. 70, 71; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 333-335, 342, 347, 354; Foelsche, "Aborigines in the Neighbourhood of Port Darwin," *JAI*, XXIV, 195.
52. Foelsche, "Aborigines in the Neighbourhood of Port Darwin," *JAI*, XXIV, 195; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 30; Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 84; II, 477.
53. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 30; Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 476 ff.
54. Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 84; cf. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 30; Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 489-490; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 180.
55. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 103 note; Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 38; Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, pp. 68-71; Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 476 ff., 489-490; *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 556-568; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 326; Gason, "Dieyerie, etc.," *JAI*, XXIV, 171; Foelsche, "Aborigines in the Neighbourhood of Port Darwin," *JAI*, XXIV, 195.
56. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 69.
57. *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 348. Cf. Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 38; Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 568.
58. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 72-73.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 108.
60. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 194.
61. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, p. 163.
62. Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, VI, 582.
63. Turner, "The Ungara District," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XI, 186.
64. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVIII, Pt. I, pp. 292-293, 328.

65. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, pp. 246, 247.
66. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 91.
67. Swanton, "The Tlingit Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XXVI, 449; Jones, *The Thlingets of Alaska*, pp. 96, 112.
68. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 196.
69. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 188-189.
70. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 369; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 168, 171, 268, 886, 409-410, 435.
71. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 509-510.
72. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 126.
73. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 366.
74. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 184.
75. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern*, II, 143.
76. Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 418.

APPENDIX I

1. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 97.
2. Cole, "The Wagogo," *JAI*, XXXII, 814.
3. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 848.
4. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 42.
5. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 59-60, 61 (quoted).
6. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Yaka," *JAI*, XXXVI, 41.
7. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 101.
8. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 14.
9. Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 59-60, 197.
10. Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 188.
11. *The Sea Dyaks*, pp. 76-77.
12. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 36; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 415; Chalmers, "Natives of Kiwai Island," *JAI*, XXXIII, 122.
13. Finsch, *Samoafahrten*, p. 91; Turner, "The Motu," *JAI*, VII, 478-479; Lawes "The Motu," *JAI*, VIII, 372.
14. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, pp. 415 ff.
15. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 213.
16. Williamson, "The Mekeo People," *JAI*, XLIII, 279-281.
17. Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, p. 214; Gason, "Dieyerie," *JAI*, XXIV, 173; Willshire, "Natives of Central Australia," *JAI*, XXIV, 184; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 36.
18. Thomson, *Thé Fijians*, p. 303.
19. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 365, 371.
20. Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 23.
21. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 471.
22. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 191-192, 194.
23. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 105.
24. "Extracts from the Diary of Mr. Strange," *JAI*, XXX, 51 (*Anthrop. Miscell.*).
25. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 180-181.
26. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 145-146, 366.
27. Bancroft, *Native Races*, II, 734.
28. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 337.

APPENDIX J

1. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 255-258.
2. Roscoe, "The Bahima," *JAI*, XXXVII, 108. Mutilation is practiced by the Awemba as a form of punishment on their own people. Stigand, "Natives of Nyassaland," *JAI*, XXXVII, 128.
3. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 284-285.
4. Roscoe, "The Baganda," *JAI*, XXXII, 60.
5. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo*, p. 193.
6. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels*, pp. 530-531.
7. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 279.
8. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 414; XXXIX, 98.
9. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, p. 225.
10. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, p. 266.
11. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 190, 293.
12. Robertson, "Káfiristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 84; Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 324.
See chapter above on Head-Hunting.
13. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 96, 305.
14. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 324 (quoted), 345, 434.
15. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 12.
16. Gason, "Dieyerie," *JAI*, XXIV, 173; Willshire, "Natives of Central Australia," *JAI*, XXIV, 84.
17. Roth, *Aborigines of Tasmania*, p. 94; Calder, "Native Tribes of Tasmania," *JAI*, III, 21.
18. Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, pp. 249-250; Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 362, 371-373; Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 108, 111-112.
19. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 164, 215, 380.
20. Mooney, "The Kiowa Indians," *An. Rep. BAE*, XVII, Pt. I, p. 260.
21. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 629.
22. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 244; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 30, Pt. II, p. 914; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 629; Hawtrey, "The Lengua Indians," *JAI*, XXXI, 282, 289; Simson, "The Jívaros," *JAI*, IX, 387. The latter people also dried and preserved the head and wore the slain man's hair in long plaits round the waist.

APPENDIX K

1. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas*, p. 444.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 320 ff. Cf. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 457. All through Africa wealth gives great social advantage. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 133, 134.
3. Willoughby, "Totemism of the Becwana," *JAI*, XXXV, 308-309.
4. Angus, "A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland," *JAI*, XXVII, 323-324.
5. Stigand, "Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Ft. Manning," *JAI*, XXXIX, 36.
6. Stannus, "British Central Africa," *JAI*, XL, 290-291, 307.
7. Macdonald, "East Central African Customs," *JAI*, XXII, 101.
8. Tate, "The Kikuyu," *JAI*, XXXIV, 263.
9. Cole, "The Wagogo," *JAI*, XXXII, 321, 338.
10. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 349.

11. Champion, "The Atharaka," *JAI*, XLII, 87.
12. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *JAI*, XLIII, 483, 487, 510.
13. Barrett, "The Wa-Giriama," *JAI*, XLI, 35.
14. Hobley, "British East Africa," *JAI*, XXXIII, 332, 333.
15. Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *JAI*, XXXVII, 59-60, 61.
16. Macdonald, "Tribes Met during Juba Expedition," *JAI*, XXIX, 231-232, 237.
17. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 398-399, 408-409, 412, 414-415.
18. Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Huana," *JAI*, XXXVI, 272, 284.
19. Ward, "Congo Tribes," *JAI*, XXIV, 290.
20. Burrows, "The Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 38, 45, 46.
21. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XXXIX, 98, 427, 429-430.
22. Roscoe, "The Bageshu," *JAI*, XXXIX, 194, 195.
23. Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, II, 539.
24. Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 72, 81.
25. Granville, Roth, and Roth, "The Jekris," *JAI*, XXVIII, 109, 117, 118.
26. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 151, 174.
27. Parkinson, "The Asaba People," *JAI*, XXXVI, 315-316.
28. De Cardi, "Ju-Ju Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XXIX, 56.
29. Hartland, "Introductory Note to Dinka Laws and Customs," *JAI*, XL, 171.
30. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, II, 492.
31. Man, "The Andaman Islands," *JAI*, XII, 108-109; Man, "Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects," *JAI*, XI, 286.
32. Sarasin, *Die Weddas von Ceylon*, pp. 475, 479, 488, 538.
33. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, I, 522.
34. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 168.
35. Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XI, 68.
36. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVI, 168, 172.
37. Watt, "Tribes of Manipur," *JAI*, XVI, 354-355.
38. Shakespear, "The Kuki-Lushai Clans," *JAI*, XXXIX, 372.
39. Hodson, "The Genna," *JAI*, XXXVI, 101.
40. Holdich, "Swatis and Afridis," *JAI*, XXIX, 7, 8 (quoted).
41. Robertson, "Káfristan," *JAI*, XXVII, 77.
42. Skeat, "The Malay Peninsula," *JAI*, XXXII, 136.
43. Knocker, "Aborigines of Sungei Ujong," *JAI*, XXXVII, 293-294.
44. Knocker, "Wild Tribes of the Ulu Plus," *JAI*, XXXIX, 146.
45. Forbes, "The Kubus of Sumatra," *JAI*, XIV, 126.
46. Roth, "Low's Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXI, 114; Hose and McDougall, "Men and Animals in Sarawak," *JAI*, XXXI, 176; Gomes, *The Sea Dyaks*, p. 88; Hose, "Natives of Borneo," *JAI*, XXIII, 171. A sorcerer is regarded as a chief in Toaripi. Chalmers, "Toaripi," *JAI*, XXVII, 334.
47. Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 15, 21.
48. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, pp. 190, 199.
49. Von Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, pp. 227; cf. Semon, *Im australischen Busch*, p. 375.
50. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 212; Seligmann, "Natives of British New Guinea," *JAI*, XXXIX, 259; Williamson, "The Mekeo People," *JAI*, XLIII, 271, 278.

51. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 329, 330. The same holds true in general of the Murray Islands. Hunt, "The Murray Islands," *JAI*, XXVIII, 7, 8.
52. Moseley, "The Admiralty Islands," *JAI*, VI, 414.
53. Danks, "Shell-money of New Britain," *JAI*, XVII, 310-311.
54. Elton, "Natives of the Solomon Islands," *JAI*, XVII, 98.
55. Somerville, "New Georgia," *JAI*, XXVI, 394-395.
56. Somerville, "The New Hebrides," *JAI*, XXXII, 8.
57. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 57, 58.
58. Palmer, "Australian Tribes," *JAI*, XIII, 282; Fison and Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai*, pp. 211-213; Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *JAI*, XLIII, 144-145; Howitt, *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, pp. 297, 302-304, 316, 320 ff., Chap. VI; Howitt, "The Dieri," *JAI*, XX, 64, 68; Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 126-127, 129; II, 295; Parker *The Euahlayi Tribe*, p. 81; Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, pp. 5, 6; Honery, "Wailwun," *JAI*, VII, 250; Willshire, "Natives of Central Australia," *JAI*, XXIV, 184; Foelsche, "Aborigines in the Neighbourhood of Port Darwin," *JAI*, XXIV, 196-197; Gason, "Dieyerie," *JAI*, XXIV, 173.
59. De Quatrefages, *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*, p. 334; Tylor, "The Tasmanians," *JAI*, XXIII, 150; Letourneau, *La Guerre*, p. 29; Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 453.
60. Tregear, "The Maoris of New Zealand," *JAI*, XIX, 99-100, 106, 107, 112-113, 117; Buller, *Forty Years in New Zealand*, pp. 239-241; Kerry-Nicholls, "Customs of the Maori Race," *JAI*, XV, 188, 193.
61. Thomson, "Natives of Savage Island," *JAI*, XXXI, 138, 140, 143, 144.
62. Lister, "Natives of Fakaofu," *JAI*, XXI, 53.
63. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 428-429, 430-431, 460.
64. Sieroshevski-Sumner, "The Yakuts," *JAI*, XXXI, 70, 73.
65. Nansen, *Eskimo Life*, pp. 119-120.
66. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 474; Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 65.
67. Jetté, "Medicine-Men of the Ten'a," *JAI*, XXXVII, 163-164.
68. Tout, "The Stlatlunh," *JAI*, XXXV, 180, 183; Tout, "The Siciatl," *JAI*, XXXIV, 22, 23; Tout, "The Stseelis," *JAI*, XXXIV, 317-318.
69. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 167, 194, 269, 275; Breysig, *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*, I, 192.
70. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 473-474.
71. Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, XV, 222.
72. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 416.
73. *Ibid.*, pp. 418, 425; "Handbook of American Indians," *BAE*, Bull. 80, Pt. II, p. 915; Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, p. 127.
74. Friß and Radin, "The Bororo Indians," *JAI*, XXXVI, 388.
75. Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, II, 245.
76. Hawtrey, "The Lengua Indians," *JAI*, XXXI, 292.
77. Markham, "Tribes of the Valley of the Amazon," *JAI*, XXIV, 242.
78. Latcham, "The Araucanos," *JAI*, XXXIX, 355.
79. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 471-472.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 471. Cf. Garson, "Tierra del Fuego," *JAI*, XV, 144.
81. Geiger, *Ostiränische Kultur*, pp. 432-434.
82. Schrader, *The Aryan Peoples*, pp. 393 ff.

83. Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, pp. 242, 246.
84. Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, II, 524.
85. Smith, *Early Arabia*, pp. 55-56.
86. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 56, 66, 161-162.
87. Meakin, "The Morocco Berbers," *JAI*, XXIV, 8-9.
88. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 496.

APPENDIX L

1. Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*, p. 101 (quoted); Hilton-Simpson, *The Kasai*, pp. 255-256; Torday and Joyce, "The Ba-Mbala," *JAI*, XXXV, 415-416; Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, IV, 18.
2. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*, I, 256-257.
3. Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 418.
4. Tremearne, "Nigerian Head-Hunters," *JAI*, XLII, 188-184.
5. Farrer, "Savage and Civilized Warfare," *JAI*, IX, 362.
6. Jacques and Storms, *L'Afrique Equatoriale*, Tome V, quoted by Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 359.
7. Macdonald, "South African Tribes," *JAI*, XIX, 266.
8. Godden, "Naga Tribes," *JAI*, XXVII, 40.
9. *Ibid.*, XXVI, 163; XXVII, 12-13.
10. Quoted by Woodthorpe, "Naga Hills," *JAI*, XL, 71.
11. *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 127-136.
12. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 447. Cf. Frobenius, *Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe*, pp. 128-129. There is a similar "Brandbrief" in the Bremer Museum.
13. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, I, 447.
14. Lacouperie, "Beginnings of Writing in and around Tibet," *Jour. Royal Asiatic Society*, XVII, Pt. III, pp. 420, 421.
15. Guise, "Tribes of the Wanigela River," *JAI*, XXVIII, 213.
16. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 416.
17. Haddon, "Torres Straits," *JAI*, XIX, 433.
18. Von Hagen, *Unter den Papua's*, p. 251.
19. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 89-90.
20. Gardiner, "Natives of Rotuma," *JAI*, XXVII, 471.
21. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 253-254.
22. Tregear, *The Maori Race*, pp. 343-344.
23. Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 571-576; Curr, *The Australian Race*, I, 256.
24. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 74.
25. Curr, *The Australian Race*, II, 38.
26. Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, I, 165.
27. Howitt, "Australian Message Sticks," *JAI*, XVIII, 823; cf. his *Native Tribes of S. E. Australia*, p. 333.
28. Farrand, *Basis of American History*, p. 245; Jähns, *Geschichte des Kriegswesens*, p. 40; Tylor, *Anthropology*, p. 224; Waitz, *Introduction to Anthropology*, III, 338.
29. Dellenbaugh, *The North-Americans of Yesterday*, p. 366.

30. Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, X, 858.
31. Mallery, "Pictographs of the American Indians," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, IV, 87-88.
32. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, pp. 127, 132-133 (quoted).
33. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 379.
34. Herrera, IV, 135, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 18.
35. Kingsborough, *Antiq. of Mexico*, VIII, quoted by Spencer, *Descriptive Sociology*, II, 17.
36. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 198.
37. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 581; II, 420, 423 (quoted).
38. Biart, *The Aztecs*, p. 248.
39. II Kings 14. 8. Cf. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, IV, 893.
40. Burckhardt, *The Bedouins*, pp. 83-84.

APPENDIX M

1. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 80.
2. Allison, "The Similkameen Indians," *JAI*, XXI, 316.
3. *Native Races*, I, 269, 407, 438.
4. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *An. Rep. Bur. Eth.*, III, 312-313, 332.
5. Cremony, *Life among the Apaches*, p. 227.
6. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 498.
7. *Ibid.*, I, 500, 543.
8. Swanton, "Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," *BAE*, Bull. 43, pp. 124, 131-132.
9. Bancroft, *Native Races*, I, 581, 629.
10. Letourneau, *Sociology*, p. 195.
11. Spix and Martius, *Travels in Brazil*, II, 249.
12. Burrows, "Natives of the Upper Welle District," *JAI*, XXVIII, 37; Weeks, "The Bangala," *JAI*, XL, 414-415; Bennett, "The Fang," *JAI*, XXIX, 92-98.
13. *The Tshi-speaking Peoples*, pp. 172-178.
14. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples*, pp. 190-191.
15. Forbes, "Ethnology of Timor-laut," *JAI*, XIII, 21.
16. Krieger, *Neu-Guinea*, p. 324.
17. Roth, "Origin of Agriculture," *JAI*, XVI, 126.
18. Solomon, "Diaries Kept in Car Nicobar," *JAI*, XXXII, 233.
19. Letourneau, *La Guerre*, pp. 194, 212.
20. Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 95-96.
21. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 192.
22. Letourneau, *Sociology*, pp. 192-198, 199.
23. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 583.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE: In the following list of authors cited in the text, the abbreviations used are:

Amer.Anth.,N.S.	American Anthropologist, New Series.
An.Rep.Bur.Eth.	Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology.
BAE	Bureau of American Ethnology.
JAI	Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
USNM	United States National Museum.

A

- Albertis, L. M. D'. New Guinea: What I Did and What I Saw. 2 vols. London, 1881.
- , Travels in New Guinea. JAI, VI, 214-228.
- Allen, F. A. The Original Range of the Papuan and Negritto Races. JAI, VIII, 38-48.
- Allison, Mrs. S. S. Account of the Similkameen Indians of British Columbia. JAI, XXI, 805-818.
- Angell, Norman. The Great Illusion. 4th ed. New York and London, 1918.
- Angus, H. C. A Year in Azimba and Chipitaland: the Customs and Superstitions of the People. JAI, XXVII, 816-825.
- Aristotle. Politics.
- Avebury, Lord. Prehistoric Times. 7th ed. New York and London, 1913. *See also* Lubbock, Sir John.
- Aymard, Capitaine. Les Touareg. Paris, 1911.

B

- Backhouse, E., and Bland, J. O. P. Annals and Memoirs of the Court of Peking. Boston and New York, 1914.
- Bagehot, Walter. Physics and Politics. New York, 1873.
- Bagge, S. The Circumcision Ceremony among the Naivasha Masai. JAI, XXXIV, 167-169.
- Balfour, H. The Use of Human Skulls as Drinking and Libation Vessels by Various Races. JAI, XXVI, 347-356.
- Bancroft, G. History of the United States. 6 vols. New York, 1883.
- Bancroft, H. H. The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America. 5 vols. New York, 1875.
- Barrett, W. E. H. Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-Giriama, etc., British East Africa. JAI, XLI, 20-39.
- Basedow, H. The Natives of Bathurst Island, North Australia. JAI, XLIII, 291-323.
- Bastian, A. Die deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste. 2 Bände. Jena, 1874.
- , Der Mensch in der Geschichte. Leipzig, 1860.
- Batchelor, Rev. J. The Ainu of Japan. New York and Chicago, no date given.

- Beard, Charles A. *The Evolution of Democracy*. In *Democracy and Reconstruction*, Edited by F. A. Cleveland and J. Schafer, Boston, 1919, pp. 486-491.
- Beardmore, E. *The Natives of Mowat, Dandai, New Guinea*. JAI, XIX, 459-473.
- Beazley, C. R. *Captain Cook*. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. 11th ed. VII.
- Bennett, A. L. *Ethnographical Notes on the Fang*, JAI, XXIX, 66-97.
- Bertin, G. *The Races of the Babylonian Empire*. JAI, XVIII, 104-118.
- Best, E. *Maori Nomenclature*. JAI, XXXII, 182-201.
- Biart, L. *The Aztecs*. Translated by J. L. Garner. Chicago, 1900.
- Bishop, A. L. (Joint author). *Physical and Commercial Geography*. Boston, 1910.
- Bland, J. O. P. (Joint author). *Annals and Memoirs of the Court of Peking*. New York and Boston, 1914.
- Boas, Franz. *The Central Eskimo*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., VI, 409-669.
- Bonney, F. *Some Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling, New South Wales*. JAI, XIII, 122-186.
- Bonwick, J. *The Australian Natives*. JAI, XVI, 201-210.
- Boscawen, W. St. Chad. *The Pre-Historic Civilization of Babylonia*. JAI, VIII, 21-36.
- Breysig, K. *Die Völker Ewiger Urzeit*. (Die Geschichte der Menschheit, Band I.) Berlin, 1907.
- Briffault, Robert. *The Mothers*. 3 vols. New York, 1927.
- Brinton, D. G. *Ethnography*. Philadelphia, 1886.
- . *Nagualism*. Philadelphia, 1894.
- British New Guinea. *Annual Report for 1890*. JAI, XXI, 75-77, 200-204.
- Bros, A. *La Religion des Peuples non civilisés*. Paris, no date given.
- Brown, A. R. *Three Tribes of Western Australia*. JAI, XLIII, 143-194.
- Brunache, P. *Le Centre de l'Afrique*. Paris, 1894.
- Buckland, Miss A. W. *Tattooing*. JAI, XVII, 318-327.
- Buckle, H. T. *History of Civilization in England*. 2d ed. 2 vols. London and New York, 1858-1862.
- Buller, Rev. J. *Forty Years in New Zealand*. London, 1878.
- Burckhardt, J. L. *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys, collected during his travels in the East*. London, 1830.
- Burrows, Captain G. *Natives of the Upper Welle District of the Belgian Congo*. JAI, XXVIII, 85-47.
- Burton, R. F. *A Mission to Gelele, King of Dahome*. 2d ed. 2 vols. London, 1864.
- Butler, John. *Rough Notes on the Angámi Nágás and Their Language*. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, XLIV, Pt. I, pp. 305-346.

C

- Calder, J. E. *Native Tribes of Tasmania*. JAI, III, 7-28.
- Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook and F. E. Adcock. Vols. I-IV. Cambridge, 1924-1926.
- Cameron, A. L. P. *Some Tribes of New South Wales*. JAI, XIV, 344-370.
- Cameron, Lieut. *On the Anthropology of Africa*. JAI, VI, 168-176.
- Cardi, Le Comte C. N. de. *Ju-Ju Laws and Customs in the Niger Delta*. JAI, XXIX, 51-61.

- Carey, B. S., and Tuck, H. N. *The Chin Hills*. 2 vols. Rangoon, 1896.
- Carr, Lucien. *The Mounds of the Mississippi Valley, Historically Considered*. In *Smithsonian Report for 1891*, pp. 503-599.
- Carr-Saunders, A. M. *The Population Problem. A Study in Human Evolution*. Oxford, 1922.
- Chadwick, H. M. *The Oak and the Thunder-God*. JAI, XXX, 22-42.
- Chalmers, Rev. J. *The Natives of Kiwai Island, Fly River, British New Guinea*. JAI, XXXIII, 117-124.
- . *Toaripi*. JAI, XXVII, 326-334.
- Champion, A. M. *The Atharaka*. JAI, XLII, 68-90.
- Christian, F. W. *The Caroline Islands*. London, 1899.
- . *Micronesian Weapons, Dress, Implements, etc.* JAI, XXVIII, 288-306.
- Christison, D. *The Gauchos of San Jorge, Central Uruguay*. JAI, XI, 34-52.
- Clark, A. *The Judicial Oaths Used on the Gold Coast*. JAI, XXIX, 310-312 (*Anthrop. Miscell.*).
- Clarke, H. *Culture of the Ashantees*. JAI, IV, 122-124.
- Codrington, Rev. R. H. *Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia*. JAI, 261-315.
- . *Poisoned Arrows in Melanesia*. JAI, XIX, 215-219.
- Cole, Rev. H. *The Wagogo of German East Africa*. JAI, XXXII, 305-338.
- Conder, C. R. *The Present Condition of the Native Tribes in Bechuanaland*. JAI, XVI, 76-92.
- Cook, Alice C. *The Aborigines of the Canary Islands*. *Amer. Anth.*, N. S., II, 451-493.
- Cox, Harold. *The Problem of Population*. New York, 1923.
- Crawley, A. E. *Sexual Taboo: a Study in the Relations of the Sexes*. JAI, XXIV, 116-125; 219-235; 430-446.
- Creed, Dr. *Aborigines of the North Coast (of Australia)*. JAI, VII, 266-268.
- Cremony, J. C. *Life among the Apaches*. San Francisco, 1868.
- Crooke, W. *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*. 2 vols. Westminster, 1896.
- . *Primitive Rites of Disposal of the Dead, with Special Reference to India*. JAI, XXIX, 271-292.
- . *Rājputs and Mahrattas*. JAI, XL, 39-48.
- . *The Hill Tribes of the Central Indian Hills*. JAI, XXVIII, 220-248.
- Crump, Rev. J. A. *Trephining in the South Seas*. JAI, XXXI, 167-172.
- Cummins, Captain S. L. *Sub-Tribes of the Bahr-el-Ghazal Dinkas*. JAI, XXXIV, 149-166.
- Cunow, Heinrich. *Die Soziale Verfassung des Inkareichs*. Stuttgart, 1896.
- Curr, E. M. *The Australian Race*. 4 vols. Melbourne and London, 1886-1887.

D

- Dale, Rev. G. *An Account of the Principal Customs and Habits of the Natives Inhabiting the Bondei Country*. JAI, XXV, 181-239.
- Dalton, O. M. (Joint Author). *Works of Art from Benin City*. JAI, XXVII, 362-382.
- Danks, Rev. B. *The Shell-Money of New Britain*. JAI, XVII, 305-317.
- Darwin, C. *The Descent of Man*. New York, 1898.
- . *Voyage of a Naturalist*. Home Library Edition, New York, no date.

- Dawson, J. *Australian Aborigines*. Melbourne, 1881.
- Dealey, James Q. *The State and Government*. New York, 1921.
- Déchelette, J. *Manuel D'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine*. 2 vols. Paris, 1908.
- DeCrespigny, Lieut. *The Milanows of Borneo*. JAI, V, 84-87.
- Dellenbaugh, F. S. *The North-Americans of Yesterday*. New York, 1901.
- Dennett, R. E. *The Philosophy of the Bavili*. JAI, XXXV, 48-55.
- Dorsey, J. O. *Omaha Sociology*. III, An. Rep. Bur. Eth., 211-370.
- . *A Study of Siouan Cults XI*, An. Rep. Bur. Eth., 361-544.
- . *Siouan Sociology*. XV, An. Rep. Bur. Eth., 213-244.
- Douglas, R. K. *The Social and Religious Ideas of the Chinese, as Illustrated in the Ideographic Characters of the Language*. JAI, XXII, 159-172.
- Dundas, Hon. C. *History of Kitui*. JAI, XLIII, 480-549.
- Dundas, Hon. K. R. *The Wawanga and Other tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa*. JAI, XLIII, 19-75.
- . *The Tribes Inhabiting the Baringo District, East Africa Protectorate*. JAI, XL, 49-72.
- Durham, M. Edith. *High Albania and Its Customs in 1908*. JAI, XL, 453-472.
- . *Some Montenegrin Manners and Customs*. JAI, XXXIX, 85-96.

E

- Edge-Partington, J. *The Ethnography of Matty Island*. JAI, XXV, 288-295.
- Elkington, E. W. (Joint author). *The Savage South Seas*. London, 1907.
- Elliot, G. F. S. *Prehistoric Man and His Story*. London, 1915.
- . *Some Notes on Native West African Customs*. JAI, XXIII, 80-83 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Ellis, A. B. *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*. London, 1890.
- . *The Tshi-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast of West Africa*. London, 1887.
- . *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa*. London, 1894.
- Ellis, H. *Man and Woman*. London and New York, 1904.
- Ellis, Rev. W. *A Journal of a Tour around Hawaii, the Largest of the Sandwich Islands*. Boston and New York, 1825.
- . *Polynesian Researches, during a Residence of Nearly Eight Years in the Society and Sandwich Islands*. New ed. 3 vols. London, 1859. 2d ed. 1831-1832.
- Elton, Lieut. F. *Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands*. JAI, XVII, 90-99.
- Evans, A. J. *Mycenaean Cyprus as Illustrated in the British Museum Excavations*. JAI, XXX, 199-220.
- Evans, I. H. N. *Notes on the Religious Beliefs, Superstitions, Ceremonies and Tabus of the Dusuns of the Tuarau and Tempassuk Districts, British North Borneo*. JAI, XLII, 380-396.

F

- Farrand, L. *Basis of American History*. (The American Nation: A History, Vol. II.) New York and London, 1904.
- Farrer, J. A. *Savage and Civilized Warfare*. JAI, IX, 358-368.

- Fawcett, F. The Kondayamkottai Maravars, a Dravidian Tribe of Tinnevely, Southern India. JAI, XXXIII, 57-65.
- Finsch, Dr. O. Samoafahrten. Leipzig, 1888.
- Fiske, John. The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America. Boston and New York, 1900.
- Fison, L. Land Tenure in Fiji. JAI, X, 332-352.
- Fison, L., and Howitt, A. W. Kamilaroi and Kurnai. Melbourne, Sydney, etc., 1880.
- Fletcher, Alice C. The Significance of the Scalp-Lock. JAI, XXVII, 436-450.
- Fletcher, Alice C., and La Flesche, F. The Omaha Tribe. An. Rep. BAE, XXVII, 33-642.
- Flower, W. H. A Collection of Monumental Heads and Artificially Deformed Crania from the Island of Mallicollo, in the New Hebrides. JAI, XI, 75-81.
- Foelsche, P. The Manners, Customs, etc., of Some Tribes of the Aborigines in the Neighbourhood of Port Darwin and the West Coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria, North Australia. JAI, XXIV, 190-198 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Forbes, H. O. Some of the Tribes of the Island of Timor. JAI, XIII, 402-430.
- . The Kubus of Sumatra. JAI, XIV, 121-126.
- . The Ethnology of Timor-laut. JAI, XIII, 8-29.
- Forrest, J. Natives of Central and Western Australia. JAI, V, 316-321.
- Frazer, J. G. The Golden Bough. 12 vols. 3d ed. London, 1907-1915.
- French-Sheldon, Mrs. Customs among the Natives of East Africa, from Teita to Kilimegalia, with Special Reference to Their Women and Children. JAI, XXI, 358-390.
- Frere, Sir H. B. The Laws Affecting the Relations between Civilized and Savage Life, as Bearing on the Dealings of Colonists with Aborigines. JAI, XI, 813-352.
- Frič, V., and Radin, P. Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians. JAI, XXXVI, 382-406.
- Fritsch, G. Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas. Breslau, 1872.
- Frobenius, L. Menschenjagden und Zweikämpfe. Jena, 1914.
- Furness, W. H. The Home-Life of Borneo Head-Hunters. Philadelphia, 1902.
- . The Ethnography of the Nagas of Eastern Assam. JAI, XXXII, 445-466.

G

- Garbutt, H. W. Native Witchcraft and Superstition in South Africa. JAI, XXXIX, 530-558.
- Gardiner, J. S. The Natives of Rotuma. JAI, XXVII, 396-435; 457-524.
- Garson, J. G. The Inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego. JAI, XV, 141-157.
- Gason, S. Of the Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, Yandrawontha, Yarawuarka, Pilladapa. JAI, XXIV, 167-176 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Geiger, W. Ostiränische Kultur im Altertum. Erlangen, 1882.
- Geikie, J. The Antiquity of Man in Europe. Edinburgh, 1914.
- Gibbon, E. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. New ed. 7 vols. London, 1900. Vol. VII.
- Gibson, J. Y. The Story of the Zulus. New ed. revised and extended. London, 1911.
- Giddings, Franklin H. Studies in the Theory of Human Society. New York, 1922.
- Gill, Rev. W. W. Some Traditions of the Hervey Islands. JAI, VI, 2-5.

- Gillen, F. J. (Joint author). *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia*. London, 1904.
- . (Joint author). *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*. London, 1899.
- Godden, Gertrude M. *Naga and Other Frontier Tribes of North-East India*. JAI, XXVI, 161-201; XXVII, 2-51.
- Godwin-Austen, H. H. *The Stone Monuments of the Khasi Hill Tribes*. JAI, I, 122-140.
- . *Garo Hill Tribes, Bengal*. JAI, II, 891-895.
- Goethe, J. W. von. *Faust*.
- Goldenweiser, Alexander A. *Early Civilization*. New York, 1922.
- Gomes, E. H. *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo*. London, 1911.
- Gomme, G. L. *Ethnology in Folklore*. New York, 1892.
- Gooch, W. D. *The Stone Age of South Africa*. JAI, XI, 124-183.
- Gottschling, Rev. E. *The Bawenda: A Sketch of Their History and Customs*. JAI, XXXV, 865-886.
- Gowland, W. *Notes on the Dolmens and Other Antiquities of Korea*. JAI, XXIV, 816-830.
- Grant, W. *Magato and His Tribe*. JAI, XXXV, 266-270.
- Granville, R. K., Roth, F. N., and Roth, H. L. *Notes on the Jekris, Sobos, and Ijos of the Warri District of the Niger Coast Protectorate*. JAI, XXVIII, 104-126.
- Green, J. D. *A Short History of the English People*. 4 vols. New York, 1893. Vol. I.
- Gregory, H. E., Keller, A. G., and Bishop, A. L. *Physical and Commercial Geography*. Boston, 1910.
- Griesbach, C. L. *Weapons and Implements Used by Kaffir Tribes and Bushmen of South Africa*. JAI, I, cliv-clv.
- Grinnell, G. B. *The Indians of To-day*. Chicago and New York, 1900.
- Groot, J. J. M. de. *The Religion of the Chinese*. New York, 1912.
- Guise, R. E. *The Tribes Inhabiting the Mouth of the Wanigela River, New Guinea*. JAI, XXVIII, 205-219.
- Gumplowicz, L. *Der Rassenkampf*. Innsbruck, 1909.

H

- Haddon, A. C. *Head-Hunters: Black, White, and Brown*. London, 1901.
- . *The Ethnography of the Western Tribe of Torres Straits*. JAI, XIX, 297-440.
- . *A Classification of the Stone Clubs of British New Guinea*. JAI, XXX, 221-250.
- Hagen, B. von. *Unter den Papua's*. Wiesbaden, 1899.
- Hale, H. *Four Huron Wampum Records*. JAI, XXVI, 221-247.
- . *The Iroquois Book of Rites*. Philadelphia, 1888.
- Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*. BAE, Bull. 30, Pts. I, II.
- Hardy, N. H., and Elkington, E. W. *The Savage South Seas*. London, 1907.
- Harper, C. H. *Notes on the Totemism of the Gold Coast*. JAI, XXXVI, 178-185.
- Harrington, J. W. *Poison Gas Fumes*. New York Times, June 8, 1928.
- Harris, W. B. *The Berbers of Morocco*. JAI, XXVII, 61-73.
- Harrison, Rev. C. *Religion and Family among the Haidas*. JAI, XXI, 14-29.

- Hartland, E. S. Introductory Note to *Dinka Laws and Customs* by Captain H. O'Sullivan. JAI, XL, 171-174.
- Hastings, J. A Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. New York, 1898-1902.
- Havemeyer, L., and Keller, A. G. *Ethnography*. New Haven, 1917.
- Hawtrej, S. H. C. *The Lengua Indians of the Paraguayan Chaco*. JAI, XXXI, 280-299.
- Heard, W. B. *Notes on the Yezidis*. JAI, XLI, 200-219.
- Herodotus. *History*.
- Hetherwick, Rev. A. *Some Animistic Beliefs among the Yaos of British Central Africa*. JAI, XXXII, 89-95.
- Hewitt, Mrs. *Some Sea-Dayak Tabus*. Man, VIII, 186-187.
- Hildburgh, W. L. *Notes on Some Tibetan and Bhutia Amulets and Folk-Medicines, and a Few Nepalese Amulets*. JAI, XXXIX, 386-396.
- . *Notes on Sinhalese Magic*. JAI, XXXVIII, 148-206.
- Hilton-Simpson, M. W. *Land and Peoples of the Kasai*. London, 1911.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. London, 1885.
- Hobley, C. W. *British East Africa: Anthropological Studies in Kavirondo and Nandi*. JAI, XXXIII, 325-359.
- . *Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs*. JAI, XL, 428-452.
- . *Further Researches into Kikuyu and Kamba Religious Beliefs and Customs*. JAI, 406-457.
- Hodson, T. C. *The Native Tribes of Manipur*. JAI, XXXI, 300-308.
- . *The "Genna" amongst the Tribes of Assam*. JAI, XXXVI, 92-103.
- Hoffman, W. J. *The Menomini Indians*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., XIV, Pt. I, 11-328.
- Holdich, Col. Sir T. H. *Swatis and Afridis*. JAI, XXIX, 2-9.
- Holland, T. H. *The Kanets of Kulu and Lahoul, Punjab: A Study in Contact-Metamorphism*. JAI, XXXII, 96-123.
- Hollis, A. C. *The History of Vumba, East Africa*. JAI, XXX, 275-297.
- Holmes, Samuel J. *The Trend of the Race*. New York, 1921.
- Holmes, W. H. *Art in Shell of the Ancient Americans*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., II, 185-305.
- . *Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities*. BAE, Bull. 60. Washington, 1919. Part I, Introductory. *The Lithic Industries*.
- Holmes, Rev. J. *Initiation Ceremonies of Natives of the Papuan Gulf*. JAI, XXXII, 418-425.
- . *The Religious Ideas of the Elema Tribe of the Papuan Gulf*. JAI, XXXII, 426-431.
- . *The Elema Tribe of the Papuan Gulf*. JAI, XXXIII, 125-134.
- Holub, Dr. E. *The Central South African Tribes from the South Coast to the Zambesi*. JAI, X, 2-19.
- Honery, T. *Wailun Language and Traditions*. JAI, VII, 246-254.
- Hopkins, E. W. *The History of Religions*. New York, 1918.
- Hore, E. C. *The Twelve Tribes of Tanganyika*. JAI, XII, 2-20.
- Hose, C. *The Natives of Borneo*. JAI, XXIII, 156-171.
- Hose, C., and McDougall, W. *The Relations between Men and Animals in Sarawak*. JAI, XXXI, 173-213.
- Hose, C., and Shelford, R. *Materials for a Study of Tatu in Borneo*. JAI, XXXVI, 60-91.

- Hough, W. Primitive American Armor. Smithsonian Report, USNM, 1893, pp. 627-651.
- Howitt, A. W. The Native Tribes of South-East Australia. London, 1904.
- . Further Notes on the Australian Class Systems. JAI, XVIII, 31-68.
- . Australian Message Sticks and Messengers. JAI, XVIII, 314-332.
- . The Dieri and Other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia. JAI, XX, 80-104.
- . (Joint author). Kamilaroi and Kurnai. Melbourne, 1880.
- Hunt, Rev. A. E. Ethnographical Notes on the Murray Islands, Torres Straits. JAI, XXVIII, 5-18.

I

- Im Thurn, E. F. The Animism of the Indians of British Guiana. JAI, XI, 360-380.

J

- Jähns, M. Geschichte des Kriegswesens von der Urzeit bis zur Renaissance. Leipzig, 1880.
- Jenks, Edward. The State and the Nation. New York, 1919.
- Jetté, Rev. J. On the Medicine-Men of the Ten'a. JAI, XXXVII, 157-188.
- Johnston, Sir Harry H. The Uganda Protectorate. 2 vols. New York and London, 1902.
- . A Survey of the Ethnography of Africa: and the Former Racial and Tribal Migrations in That Continent. JAI, XLIII, 375-421.
- . The Negro in the New World. New York, 1910.
- Johnstone, H. B. The Customs of the Tribes Occupying Mombasa Sub-District, British East Africa. JAI, XXXII, 263-272.
- Jones, L. F. A Study of the Thlingets of Alaska. New York, 1914.
- Jordan, Virgil. The Peace Myth. American Mercury, May, 1924, 2: 5: 1-9.
- Joyce, T. A. (Joint author). *See* Torday.

K

- Keane, A. H. On the Botocudos. JAI, XIII, 199-213.
- . Ethnology of Egyptian Sudan. JAI, XIV, 91-113.
- . The Lapps: Their Origin, etc. JAI, XV, 213-235.
- Keith, A. The Antiquity of Man. London, 1915.
- Keller, A. G. Homeric Society. New York, 1906.
- . Colonization. Boston, 1908.
- . Societal Evolution. New York, 1916.
- . Through War to Peace. New York, 1918.
- . (Joint author). Physical and Commercial Geography. Boston, 1910.
- . (Joint author). Ethnography. New Haven, 1917.
- . The Luck Element. The Scientific Monthly, Feb. 1917, IV, 145-150.
- . Birth Control. Yale Review. Vol. VII, No. I, pp. 129-139.
- . The Right to Life. Unpopular Review. Vol. VII, No. 14, pp. 286-301.
- . (Joint author). The Science of Society. 4 vols. New Haven, 1927.
- Keller, Dr. F. The Lake Dwellings of Switzerland and Other Parts of Europe. Translated by J. E. Lee. 2 vols. London, 1878.

- Kerry-Nicholls, J. H. *The Origin, Physical Characteristics, and Manners and Customs of the Maori Race.* JAI, XV, 187-208.
- Kiehl, A. H. *Notes on the Javanese.* JAI, VI, 346-363.
- Kincaid, Col. *The Bheel Tribes of the Vindhyan Range.* JAI, IX, 397-405.
- Kingsley, Mary H. *Travels in West Africa.* 2d ed. abridged. London, 1898.
- . *West African Studies.* New York, 1899.
- Klose, H. *Togo.* Berlin, 1899.
- Knocker, F. W. *The Wild Tribes of the Ulu Plus, Perak.* JAI, XXXIX, 142-155.
- . *The Aborigines of Sungei Ujong.* JAI, XXXVII, 290-305.
- Koch-Grünberg, Dr. T. *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern: Reisen in Nordwest-Brasilien.* 2 Bände. Berlin, 1910.
- Koettlitz, R. *The Galla of Walega and the Bertat.* JAI, XXX, 50-54.
- Kovalevsky, M. *The Lex Barbarorum of the Daghestan.* JAI, XXV, 112-116.
- Kremer, A. von. *Kulturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen.* 2 Bände. Wien, 1875.
- Krieger, Dr. M. *Neu-Guinea.* Berlin, 1899.
- Kroeber, A. L. *Anthropology.* New York, 1923.
- Kubary, J. S. *Ethnographische Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Karolinen Archipels.* Leiden, 1895.

L

- Lacouperie, Dr. T. de. *Beginnings of Writing in and around Tibet.* Journ. Royal Asiatic Soc., XVII, Pt. III.
- La Flesche, F. (Joint author). *The Omaha Tribe.* An. Rep. BAE, XXVII, 33-642.
- Latham, R. E. *Ethnology of the Araucanos.* JAI, XXXIX, 334-370.
- . *Physical Characteristics of the Araucanos.* JAI, XXXIV, 170-180.
- Lawes, W. G. *Ethnological Notes on the Motu, Koitapu and Koiari Tribes of New Guinea.* JAI, VIII, 369-376.
- Letourneau, Dr. C. *Sociology.* Translated by H. M. Trollope. London, 1881.
- . *La Guerre dans les diverses races humaines.* Paris, 1895.
- . *L'Evolution du Commerce.* Paris, 1897.
- . *Le Passé et l'Avenir de la Guerre.* In *Revue de L'Ecole d'Anthropologie de Paris*, 1893, Vol. III.
- Lewin, T. H. *Wild Races of South-Eastern India.* London, 1870.
- Lewis, A. L. *Some Apparent Coincidences of Custom and Belief among the Ancient Chaldeans and the Peoples of Western Europe.* JAI, VI, 136-140.
- Lippert, J. *Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit in ihrem organischen Aufbau.* 2 Bände. Stuttgart, 1887.
- Lister, J. J. *Notes on the Natives of Fakaofu (Bowditch).* JAI, XXI, 43-62.
- Livingstone, D. *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; Including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa.* London, 1857.
- . *The Last Journals.* New York, 1875.
- Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita.*
- Lloyd, T. G. B. *The Beothucs.* JAI, IV, 21-37.
- . *Indian Remains Found on the Coast of Labrador.* JAI, IV, 39-43.
- Lowie, Robert H. *Culture and Ethnology.* New York, 1917.
- . *Primitive Society.* New York, 1920.

——. *Primitive Religion*. New York, 1924.

Lubbock, Sir John. *The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man*. London, 1870.

——. *British Ass'n Report, Dundee Meeting, 1867*. Pt. IV. Notices and Abstracts. London, 1868.

——. Note on the Macas Indians. *JAI*, III, 29-31.

——. On the Customs of Marriage and Systems of Relationship among the Australians. *JAI*, XIV, 292-300.

See also Lord Avebury.

Lyell, Sir Charles. *Antiquity of Man*. London, 1863.

M

MacCurdy, G. G. *The Eolithic Problem*. Amer. Anth., N. S., Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 425-479.

——. Some Phases of Prehistoric Archaeology. In the Proceedings of the Amer. Ass'n for the Advancement of Science. Vol. LVI, 1907.

——. La Combe, a Paleolithic Cave in the Dordogne. Amer. Anth., N. S., Vol. XVI, No 2, pp. 157-184.

——. *Human Origins. A Manual of Prehistory*. 2 vols. New York, 1924.

Macdonald, Rev. J. *Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes*. *JAI*, XIX, 264-296; XX, 118-140.

——. *East Central African Customs*. *JAI*, XXII, 99-122.

Macdonald, Lieut-Col. J. R. L. Notes on the Ethnology of Tribes Met with during Progress of the Juba Expedition of 1897-99. *JAI*, XXIX, 226-247.

MacIver, D. Recent Anthropometrical Work in Egypt. *JAI*, XXX, 95-103.

MacIver, R. M. *Community, A Sociological Study*. London, 1917.

McDougall, W. (Joint author). *The Relations between Men and Animals in Sarawak*. *JAI*, XXXI, 173-213.

McGee, W. J. *The Seri Indians*. An. Rep. BAE, XVII, Pt. I, 9-344.

McGuire, J. D. Pipes and Smoking Customs of the American Aborigines. Smithsonian Report, USNM, 1897, Pt. I, pp. 361-645.

Maine, Sir Henry S. *Early Law and Custom*. New York, 1883.

——. *Ancient Law, Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas*. New York, 1906.

Mallery, G. *Pictographs of the North American Indians*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., IV, 13-253.

——. *Picture-Writing of the American Indians*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., X, 25-776.

Malthus, T. R. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London, 1807.

Man, E. H. *The Andaman Islands*. *JAI*, VII, 105-109 (Anthrop. Miscell.).

——. *The Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects Presented to Maj.-Gen. Pitt Rivers*. *JAI*, XI, 268-294.

——. *The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands*. *JAI*, XII, 69-175, 327-434.

March, H. C. *The Mythology of Wise Birds*. *JAI*, XXVII, 209-232.

Markham, Sir Clements R. *A List of the Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon, Including Those on the Banks of the Main Stream and of All Its Tributaries*. *JAI*, XXIV, 236-284; XL, 73-140.

——. *The Incas of Peru*. London, 1910.

Martius, C. F. P. von. *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas, zumal Brasiliens*. Band I. Leipzig, 1867.

- . (Joint author). *Travels in Brazil, in the Years 1817-1820*. Translated. 2 vols. London, 1824.
- Mason, O. T. *Woman's Share in Primitive Culture*. New York, 1894.
- . *The Origins of Invention*. London, 1895.
- Mathews, R. H. *The Boro, or Initiation Ceremonies of the Kamilaroi Tribe*. JAI, XXIV, 411-427; XXV, 318-339.
- . *The Bûrbûng of the Wiradthuri Tribes*. JAI, XXV, 295-318; XXVI, 272-285.
- . *The Keeparra Ceremony of Initiation*. JAI, XXVI, 320-340.
- Matthews, M. C. *On the Manners, Customs, Religion, Superstitions, etc., of the Australian Native*. JAI, XXIV, 186-190 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Meakin, J. E. B. *The Morocco Berbers*. JAI, XXIV, 1-14.
- Meisner, Dr. *Danewerk und Hedeby. Ein Rückblick auf vormittelalterliche Befestigungen*. In *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XXXVI, 675-697. Berlin, 1904.
- Miller, H. A. (Joint author). *Old World Traits Transplanted*. New York, 1922.
- Moggridge, L. T. *The Nyassaland Tribes, Their Customs and Their Poison Ordeal*. JAI, XXXII, 467-472.
- Montefiore, A. *The Samoyads of the Great Tundra*. JAI, XXIV, 388-410.
- Monteiro, J. J. *The Quissama Tribe of Angola*. JAI, V, 198-201.
- Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat. *The Spirit of Laws*. Translated from the French by Thomas Nugent. 2 vols. London, 1878.
- Mooney, J. *The Ghost-Dance Religion*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., XIV, Pt. II, pp. 653-1102.
- . *Calendar History of the Kiowa Indians*. An. Rep. BAE, XVII, Pt. I, pp. 141-144.
- Moore, H. H. *Public Health in the United States*. New York, 1928.
- Morgan, L. H. *League of the Ho-dê-no-sau-nee or Iroquois*. New York, 1851.
- Mortillet, G. et A. de. *Le Préhistorique*. 8d ed. Paris, 1900.
- Mosely, H. N. *Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands*. JAI, VI, 379-420.
- Mucke, J. R. *Horde und Familie*. Stuttgart, 1895.
- Mullens, J. *Origin and Progress of the People of Madagascar*. JAI, V, 181-196.
- Munro, N. G. *Prehistoric Japan*. Yokohama, 1911.
- Muret-Sanders. *Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch*. Berlin-Schöneberg, 1910.
- Musters, Lieut. *On the Races of Patagonia*. JAI, I, 198-206.
- Myers, C. S. (Joint author). *A Contribution to the Anthropology of the Sudan*. JAI, XL, 141-163.

N

- Nachtigal, G. *Sahara und Sudan*. 2 Bände. Berlin, 1879-1881.
- Nansen, F. *Eskimo Life*. Translated by W. Archer. London, 1893.
- Nassau, Rev. R. H. *Fetichism in West Africa*. New York, 1904.
- Nelson, E. W. *The Eskimo about Bering Strait*. An. Rep. BAE, XVIII, Pt. I, pp. 19-518.
- New Testament*.
- Nicholas, F. C. *The Aborigines of the Province of Santa Marta, Colombia*. Amer. Anth., N.S., III, 606-649.
- Nieboer, H. J. *Slavery as an Industrial System*. 2d rev. ed. The Hague, 1910.
- Northcote, G. A. S. *The Nilotic Kavirondo*. JAI, XXXVII, 58-66.
- Novicow, J. *War and Its Alleged Benefits*. Trans. by Thomas Seltzer. New York, 1911.

O

- O'Ferrall, Rev. W. *Native Stories from Santa Cruz and Reef Islands*. JAI, XXXIV, 223-233.
 Ogburn, W. F. *Social Change*. New York, 1922.
 Old Testament.
 Oppenheimer, Franz. *The State*. New York, 1928.
 O'Sullivan, Capt. H. *Dinka Laws and Customs*. JAI, XL, 171-191.

P

- Palmer, E. *Notes on Some Australian Tribes*. JAI, XIII, 276-334.
 Park, R. E., and Miller, H. A. *Old World Traits Transplanted*. New York, 1922.
 Parker, K. L. *The Euahlayi Tribe. A Study of Aboriginal Life in Australia*. London, 1905.
 Parkinson, J. *Notes on the Asaba People (Ibos) of the Niger*. JAI, XXXVI, 312-324.
 Paulitschke, Dr. P. *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas*. 2 Bände. Berlin, 1893 and 1896.
 Payne, E. J. *History of the New World called America*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1892-99.
 Peal, S. E. *The Nagas and Neighbouring Tribes*. JAI, III, 476-479.
 —. On the "Morong," as Possibly a Relic of Pre-Marriage Communism. JAI, XXII, 244-261.
 Pennefather, F. W. *On the Natives of New Zealand*. JAI, XVI, 211-216.
 Petrie, W. M. F. *The Races of Early Egypt*. JAI, XXXI, 248-255.
 —. *Migrations*. JAI, XXXVI, 189-232.
 Pfeil, G. von. *Duk Duk and Other Customs as Forms of Expression of the Melanesians' Intellectual Life*. JAI, XXVII, 181-191.
 Philippi, Dr. *Easter Island*. JAI, V, 111-114.
 Phillips, R. C. *The Lower Congo; a Sociological Study*. JAI, XVII, 214-233.
 Pinart, A. *Les Indiens de l'état de Panama*. *Revue d'Ethnographie*, VI.
 Pinches, T. G. *Upon the Types of the Early Inhabitants of Mesopotamia*. JAI, XXI, 86-97.
 Ploss, H. H. *Das Weib in der Natur und Völkerkunde*. 2 Bände. Leipzig, 1905.
 Pommerol, Mme. Jean. *Une Femme chez les Sahariennes*. Paris, no date given.
 Pope-Hennessy, Lieut. H. *The Jukos and Other Tribes of the Middle Benue*. JAI, XXX, 24-31 of *Anthrop. Reviews and Miscell.*
 Portman, M. V. *Notes on the Andamanese*. JAI, XXV, 361-371.
 Powers, S. *The Tribes of California*. Washington, 1877.
 Prescott, William H. *History of the Conquest of Peru*. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1874.
 —. *History of the Conquest of Mexico*. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1871, 1876.
 Price, F. G. H. *A Description of the Quissama Tribe*. JAI, I, 185-193.
 Pryer, W. B. *The Natives of British North Borneo*. JAI, XVI, 229-236.

Q

- Quatrefages, A. de. *Hommes Fossiles et Hommes Sauvages*. Paris, 1884.

R

- Radin, P. (Joint author). *Contributions to the Study of the Bororo Indians*. JAI, XXXVI, 382-406.

- Rae, Dr. J. Eskimo Migrations. JAI, VII, 125-131.
- Ratzel, F. The History of Mankind. 3 vols. Translated from the second German edition by A. J. Butler. London and New York, 1896.
- Ray, S. H. The People and Languages of New Ireland and Admiralty Islands. JAI, XXI, 3-13.
- Read, C. H., and Dalton, O. M. Works of Art from Benin City. JAI, XXVII, 362-382.
- Reuter, E. B. Population Problems. Philadelphia, 1923.
- Ribbe, C. Zwei Jahre unter den Kannibalen der Salomo-Inseln. Dresden-Blasewitz, 1903.
- Risley, H. H. Ethnography of India. (Census of India, 1901, Vol. I). Calcutta, 1903.
- Rivers, W. H. R. The Todas. London, 1906.
- . Social Organization. New York and London, 1924.
- Robertson, Sir G. S. Káfiristan and Its People. JAI, XXVII, 75-89.
- Robinson, E. V. War and Economics in History and in Theory. Political Science Quarterly, XV, 581-622.
- Rockhill, W. W. Notes on the Ethnology of Tibet. Smithsonian Report, USNM, 1893, pp. 669-747.
- Roscoe, Rev. J. Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda. JAI, XXXI, 117-130; XXXII, 25-30.
- . The Bahima: A Cow Tribe of Enkole in the Uganda Protectorate. JAI, XXXVII, 93-118.
- . Notes on the Bageshu. JAI, XXXIX, 181-195.
- Ross, E. A. Principles of Sociology. New York, 1920.
- . Social Control. New York, 1901.
- Roth, F. N. (Joint author). Notes on the Jekris, Sobos, and Ijos of the Warri District of the Niger Coast Protectorate. JAI, XXVIII, 104-126.
- Roth, H. Ling. The Aborigines of Tasmania. London, 1890.
- . The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo. 2 vols. New York, 1896.
- . Great Benin. Its Customs, Art and Horrors. Halifax, England, 1903.
- . The Origin of Agriculture. JAI, XVI, 102-136.
- . The Aborigines of Hispaniola. JAI, XVI, 247-286.
- . Low's Natives of Borneo. JAI, XXI, 110-134; XXII, 22-64.
- . Maori Tatu and Moko. JAI, XXXI, 29-64.
- . Tatu in the Society Islands. JAI, XXXV, 283-294.
- Routledge, W. S. and Katherine. With a Prehistoric People: The Akikúyu of British East Africa. London, 1910.
- Russell, F. The Pima Indians. An. Rep. BAE, XXVI, 17-389.

S

- St. John, H. C. The Ainos: Aborigines of Yeso. JAI, II, 248-254.
- St. John, R. F. Hill Tribes of North Aracan. JAI, II, 233-246.
- Sarasin, P. und F. Die Weddahs von Ceylon. Wiesbaden, 1893.
- Saunders, H. S. Notes on Corea and Its People. JAI, XXIV, 299-316.
- Schrader, Dr. O. Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples. Translated by F. B. Jevons. London, 1890.

- Schweinfurth, G. Heart of Africa. 2 vols. Trans. by E. E. Frewer. New York, 1874.
- Seligmann, C. G. The Melanesians of British New Guinea. Cambridge, 1910.
- . The Preparation and Use of the Kenyah Dart-poison *Ipo*h. JAI, XXXII, 239-244.
- . A Classification of the Natives of British New Guinea. JAI, XXXIX, 246-275.
- Semon, R. Im australischen Busch und an den Küsten des Korallenmeeres. Leipzig, 1896.
- Seymour, T. D. Life in the Homeric Age. New York, 1907.
- Shakespeare, Lieut.-Col. J. The Kuki-Lushai Clans. JAI, XXXIX, 371-385.
- Shakespeare, W. Much Ado about Nothing.
- Sheane, J. H. W. Some Aspects of the Awemba Religion and Superstitious Observances. JAI, XXXVI, 150-158.
- Shelford, R. A Provisional Classification of the Swords of the Sarawak Tribes. JAI, XXXI, 219-227.
- . (Joint author). Materials for a Study of Tatu in Borneo. JAI, XXXVI, 60-91.
- Shooter, Rev. J. The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country. London, 1857.
- Sibree, Rev. J. Relationships and the Names Used for Them among the Peoples of Madagascar, Chiefly the Horas; Together with Observations upon Marriage Customs and Morals among the Malagasy. JAI, IX, 35-49.
- . Curious Words and Customs Connected with Chieftainship and Royalty among the Malagasy. JAI, XXI, 215-229.
- Sieroshevski, M. The Yakuts. Translated and abridged from the Russian by W. G. Sumner. JAI, XXXI, 65-110.
- Simson, A. Notes on the Záparos. JAI, VII, 502-510.
- . On the Piojés of the Putumayo. JAI, VIII, 210-221.
- . Notes on the Jívaros and Canelos Indians. JAI, IX, 385-393.
- . Notes on the Napo Indians. JAI, XII, 21-27.
- Skeat, W. W. The Wild Tribes of the Malay Peninsula. JAI, XXXII, 124-141.
- Smith, W. Robertson. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia. Cambridge, 1885.
- Smyth, R. B. The Aborigines of Victoria. 2 vols. London, 1878.
- Sollas, W. J. Ancient Hunters. 2d ed. London, 1915.
- Solomon, V. Extracts from Diaries Kept in Car Nicobar. JAI, XXXII, 202-237.
- Somerville, Lieut. B. T. Ethnological Notes on New Hebrides. JAI, XXIII, 363-393.
- . Notes on Some Islands of the New Hebrides. JAI, XXIII, 2-20.
- . Ethnographical Notes in New Georgia, Solomon Islands. JAI, XXVI, 357-412.
- Spencer, B., and Gillen, F. J. The Native Tribes of Central Australia. London, 1899.
- . The Northern Tribes of Central Australia. London, 1904.
- Spencer, H. Descriptive Sociology. 8 vols. New York, 1873-1881.
- . The Study of Sociology. New York and London, 1910.
- . The Principles of Sociology. 3d. ed. 3 vols. New York and London, 1912.
- Spix, Dr. J. B. von, and Martius, Dr. C. F. P. von. Travels in Brazil, in the Years 1817-1820. Trans. 2 vols. London, 1824.
- Stannus, H. S. Notes on Some Tribes of British Central Africa. JAI, XL, 285-335.

- Steere, E. *East African Tribes and Languages*. JAI, I, cxliv-cliv.
- Stevenson, Matilda C. *The Sia*. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., XI, 9-157.
- Stigand, Capt. C. H. *The Natives of Nyassaland, N. E. Rhodesia, and Portuguese Zambesia, Their Arts, Customs, and Modes of Subsistence*. JAI, XXXVII, 119-132.
- . *The Tribes in the Neighbourhood of Fort Manning, Nyassaland*. JAI, XXXIX, 35-43.
- Stow, G. W. *The Native Races of South Africa*. London, 1905.
- Strabo. *Geographia*.
- Strange, J. *Extracts from the Diary of Mr. James Strange*. JAI, XXX, 50-62 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Sumner, W. G. *Folkways*. Boston, 1906.
- . *War and Other Essays*. New Haven, 1913.
- . *Earth-Hunger and Other Essays*. New Haven, 1913.
- . *The Challenge of Facts and Other Essays*. New Haven, 1914.
- . *The Yakuts*. Abridged from the Russian of Sieroshevski. JAI, XXXI, 65-110.
- Sumner, W. G., and Keller, A. G., *The Science of Society*. 4 vols. New Haven, 1927.
- Swanton, J. R. *Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and Adjacent Coast of the Gulf of Mexico*. BAE, Bull. 43, 1911.
- . *Social Condition, Beliefs, and Linguistic Relationship of the Tlingit Indians*. An. Rep. BAE, XXVI, 395-485.
- Sykes, M. *The Kurdish Tribes of the Ottoman Empire*. JAI, XXXVIII, 451-486.

T

- Tacitus. *Germania*.
- Talbot, P. A. *The Buduma of Lake Chad*. JAI, XLI, 245-259.
- Tate, H. R. *The Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes of British East Africa*. JAI, XXXIV, 130-148.
- . *Further Notes on the Kikuyu Tribe of British East Africa*. JAI, XXXIV, 255-265.
- Taylor, R. *Te Ika Maul*. London, 1870.
- Thomson, B. *The Fijians*. London, 1908.
- . *The Kalou-Vu (Ancestor-Gods) of the Fijians*. JAI, XXIV, 340-359.
- . *The Natives of Savage Island, or Niué*. JAI, XXXI, 137-145.
- Thurston, E. *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*. Madras, 1906.
- Tomkins, Rev. H. G. *The Hyksôs or Shepherd Kings of Egypt*. JAI, XIX, 183-198.
- Torday, E. *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds*. London, 1913.
- Torday, E., and Joyce, T. A. *Notes on the Ethnography of the Ba-Mbala*. JAI, XXXV, 398-426.
- . *The Ethnography of the Ba-Yaka*. JAI, XXXVI, 39-58.
- . *The Ethnography of the Ba-Huana*. JAI, XXXVI, 272-301.
- . *The Ethnology of the South-Western Congo Free State*. JAI, XXXVII, 133-156.
- Tourmagne, A. *Histoire de l'Esclavage ancien et moderne*. Paris, 1880.
- Tout, C. H. *Report on the Ethnology of the Siciatl of British Columbia, a Coast Division of the Salish Stock*. JAI, XXXIV, 20-91.

- . Ethnological Report on the Stseēlis and Skaūlits Tribes of the Halōkmelem Division of the Salish of British Columbia. JAI, XXXIV, 811-876.
- . Report on the Ethnology of the Stlatlunh of British Columbia. JAI, XXXV, 126-218.
- . Report on the Ethnology of the South-Eastern Tribes of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. JAI, XXXVII, 806-874.
- Tozzer, Alfred M. Social Origins and Social Continuities. New York, 1925.
- Tregear, E. The Maori Race. Wanganui, New Zealand, 1904.
- . The Maoris of New Zealand. JAI, XIX, 97-128.
- . The Spirit of Vegetation. JAI, XXXI, 157-159.
- Tremearne, Major A. J. N. The Kagoro and Other Nigerian Head-Hunters. JAI, XLII, 186-199.
- Tuck, H. N. (Joint author). The Chin Hills. 2 vols. Rangoon, 1896.
- Tucker, A. Winifred, and Myers, C. S. A Contribution to the Anthropology of the Sudan. JAI, XL, 141-163.
- Turner, G. Samoa. London, 1884.
- Turner, L. M. Ethnology of the Ungara District, Hudson Bay Territory. An. Rep. Bur. Eth., XI, 167-350.
- Turner, Rev. W. Y. The Ethnology of the Motu. JAI, VII, 470-498.
- Tylor, E. B. Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization. London, 1865.
- . Primitive Culture. 2 vols. New York, 1874.
- . Anthropology. New York, 1909.
- . The Tasmanians as Representatives of Palaeolithic Man. JAI, XXIII, 141-152.
- . On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, Applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent. JAI, XVIII.
- . The Hale Series of Huron Wampum Belts. JAI, XXVI, 248-254.
- . Remarks on Totemism, with Special Reference to Some Modern Theories Respecting It. JAI, XXVIII, 138-148.
- . The Totem-Post from the Haida Village of Masset, Queen Charlotte Islands. JAI, XXVIII, 133-135.
- . The Matriarchal Family System. Nineteenth Century, XL, 81-96.

V

- Van Hieu, A. Notes on the Totemism of the Gold Coast. JAI, XXXVI, 185-188.

W

- Waddell, L. A. The Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism. London, 1893.
- . Some Ancient Indian Charms, from the Tibetan. JAI, XXIV, 41-44.
- . The Poisoned Arrows of the Akas. JAI, XXIV, 57.
- Waitz, F. T. Introduction to Anthropology. London, 1863.
- Wake, C. S. Mental Characteristics of Primitive Man as Exemplified by the Australian Aborigines. JAI, I, 74-84.
- . Notes on the Polynesian Race. JAI, X, 109-122.
- Ward, H. Ethnographical Notes Relating to the Congo Tribes. JAI, XXIV, 285-299.

- Warnshuis, A. L. Slavery in 1926. *The Survey*, August 1, 1926, LVI, No. 9, pp. 485-488.
- Watt, Dr. G. The Aboriginal Tribes of Manipur. *JAI*, XVI, 346-368.
- Webster, H. Primitive Secret Societies. New York, 1908.
- . Totem Clans and Secret Associations in Australia and Melanesia. *JAI*, XLI, 482-508.
- Weeks, Rev. J. H. Congo Life and Folklore. London, 1911.
- . Among Congo Cannibals. London, 1913.
- . Among the Primitive Bakongo. London, 1914.
- . Anthropological Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River. *JAI*, XXXIX, 97-186; 416-459; XL, 360-427.
- Werner, A. The Natives of British Central Africa. London, 1906.
- Westermarck, E. The Nature of the Arab *Ġinn*, Illustrated by the Present Beliefs of the People of Morocco. *JAI*, XXIX, 252-268.
- . The History of Human Marriage. 3 vols. London, 1921.
- Wheelwright, C. A. Native Circumcision Lodges in the Zoutpansberg District. *JAI*, XXXV, 251-255.
- White, R. B. The Aboriginal Races of the North-Western Provinces of South America. *JAI*, XIII, 240-256.
- Whitmee, S. J. The Ethnology of Polynesia. *JAI*, VIII, 261-274.
- Whitnall, Harold O. In Defense of the Cave-Man. *The Scientific Monthly*, June, 1926.
- Wickham, H. A. The Soumoo or Woolwa Indians, of Blewfields River, Mosquito Territory. *JAI*, XXIV, 198-208 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Williamson, R. W. Some Unrecorded Customs of the Mekeo People of British New Guinea. *JAI*, XLIII, 268-290.
- Willoughby, Rev. W. C. Notes on the Totemism of the Becwana. *JAI*, XXXV, 295-314.
- . Notes on the Initiation Ceremonies of the Becwana. *JAI*, XXXIX, 228-245.
- Willshire, W. H. The Manners, Customs, Religion, Superstitions, etc., of the Natives of Central Australia. *JAI*, XXIV, 183-184 (Anthrop. Miscell.).
- Wines, F. H. Punishment and Reformation. 3d ed. rev. New York, 1919.
- Winslow, C.-E. A. The Evolution and Significance of the Modern Public Health Campaign. New Haven, 1923.
- . Man and the Microbe; How Communicable Diseases Are Controlled. New York and London, 1924.
- Wissler, Clark. Man and Culture. New York, 1923.
- Woodford, C. M. The Canoes of the British Solomon Islands. *JAI*, XXXIX, 506-516.
- Woodthorpe, Col. R. G. The Wild Tribes Inhabiting the So-called Naga Hills, on Our North-East Frontier of India. *JAI*, XI, 56-72.
- . Some Account of the Shans and Hill Tribes of the States on the Mekong. *JAI*, XXVI, 13-28.
- Wright, Harold. Population. New York, 1923.
- Wundt, Wilhelm. Elements of Folk Psychology. London and New York, 1916.

Y

- Yule, Col. C. B. Analogies of Manners between the Indo-Chinese Races and the Races of the Indian Archipelago. *JAI*, IX, 290-300.

INDEX

- Adoption, 67, 169, 191-192, 220.
 Adultery, 97, 98, 99.
 Agriculture, 25, 26, 27-28, 174-175, 224.
 Aleatory element, 104, 111, 132, 133.
 Alliance, 163, 197, 217-218.
 Amazon myths, 30.
 Amazons of Dahomey, 30-32.
 Ambassadors, 183-185, 187, 190.
 Annihilation, 58-60, 64, 144-145, 230, 258-264.
 Antagonistic coöperation, 11.
 Archaeology, 2-8.
 Arts of life, 76-77, 232; stages of the, 10, 11.
 Arts of war contributing to arts of peace, 226-228.
 Asylum, right of, 192-193, 208-209, 211.
 Aviation, 227.
 "Bedouin livelihood," 81, 82.
 Birth control, 10, 232.
 Blood bond, 17, 121, 124, 212.
 Blood-brotherhood, 212-213.
 Blood drinking, 75, 212-213.
 Blood feud, 17, 122-129, 211-214, 268-277.
 Blood-mixing, 212-213.
 Blood revenge, 18, 120-129, 210-214, 268-277.
 Bloodshed, children inured to, 37-38, 237-240.
 Booty, 69; war for, 80-95, 265-267.
 Boys trained for war, 86-89, 237-243.
 Calumet, 184, 187, 190.
 Cannibalism, 13, 66-75, 130-131; as a cause of war, 67-69; as a result of war, 69-71; for hatred and revenge, 72-74; for religious reasons, 74-75.
 Cattle stealing, 84-87.
 Champions, 177-179, 244, 246.
 Chauvinism, 22, 232.
 Chiefs, 184, 212, 214; apotheosized, 100-111; as medicine men, 288, 290; given special burial, 108-110; graves of, sacred, 193, 208; propitiated, 131-132; rivalry of, 149-150.
 Chieftainship, 141, 161-162, 164, 204, 285-291.
 Chivalry, 176, 181, 193-194, 294, 295.
 Civil war, 57, 125, 177, 178, 270-271.
 Civilization, *see* Culture.
 "Civilizing mission," 151.
 Colonies, 150-151, 173, 222, 224.
 Combat, gladiatorial, 194; single, 53, 177-179, 244, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250; trial by, 177-178, 211.
Commercium, 199-202.
 Compensation, 123, 125, 127-128, 214.
 Competition of life, 12, 16, 17, 22, 23, 39, 46, 54, 78, 122, 160, 161, 219, 220, 232.
Connubium, 196-198.
 Conquest, 59, 63, 81, 165-175, 220-221, 228, 230, 261-262.
 Coöperation, 11, 16-18, 24, 160, 196, 199, 233.
 "Counting coup," 41, 155.
 Cowards despised, 40, 43, 50, 106.
 Criminal law, 120, 127; 214.
 Crusades, 117-119, 231.
 Cult, 104, 114, 212; of rulers and subjects, 107-108.
 Cultural inertia, 6.
 Culture, 1-2, 6, 9, 12, 26, 45, 96, 102; diffusion of, 102, 175, 203, 216, 220, 221-224, 230.
 Curses, 114.
 Declaration of war, 176-177, 292-296.
 Democracy, primitive, 161-162, 164, 285-291.
 Diplomacy, 204, 206, 292.
 Discipline, 24, 39, 163-164, 168-169, 170, 172, 226.

- Division of labor, 175, 228-229; by sex, 23-30, 97, 225, 242.
- Duel, 214.
- Earth-hunger, 77, 79.
- Economic necessity, doctrine of, 150-151.
- Elopement, 97, 98, 99, 177.
- Endogamy, 102, 197.
- Ethnocentrism, 21-22, 90, 105, 232, 234-236.
- Ethnology, 1-2.
- Evil eye, 115.
- Excitement, love of, 147-149.
- Exogamy, 102, 196-197.
- Fighting conventionalized, 148, 177-179, 209, 211, 292, 294.
- Fighting tabooed, 207-209.
- Firearms, 52, 54, 55, 60-63, 182.
- Folkways, as unifying force, 17; nature of, 11-12.
- Food-quest, 66, 76.
- Fortifications, 5, 58, 173, 255-256.
- Ghost-fear, 11, 12, 103, 104, 120, 121.
- Government, 205, 214; and war, 160-175, 229; by discussion, 233; developed, 164-175; primitive, 160-162, 285-291.
- Group responsibility, 17, 122-129, 214, 268-277.
- Group slavery, 88-89, 256.
- Guest-friendship, 215-217.
- Guilt, notion of, 127.
- Head-hunting, 66, 136-146, 152, 153, 156.
- Heralds, 184-185, 188, 295.
- Herders and tillers, conflict of, 49-50, 63, 87-89, 255-256.
- Hero worship, 110-111.
- Horde, 160.
- Hospitality, 46-47, 215-217.
- Human sacrifice, 37-38, 74, 111, 112, 130-135, 139.
- Immunity purchased, 185-186.
- Imperialism, 151.
- Industrialism versus militarism, 25, 233.
- Infanticide, 219-220.
- In-group mores versus out-group mores, 39, 105, 122, 271, 273, 274-275.
- Initiation ceremonies, 38-39, 237-243.
- Intercourse between tribes, 186, 199, 207, 215. *See* Isolation.
- Intermarriage, peaceful and political effects of, 196-198.
- Inured to bloodshed, 37-38, 55-56, 237-240.
- Inventiveness promoted by war, 226-227.
- Inviolability, 177, 183-185, 186, 187, 190, 192-193, 203, 206, 208-209, 211, 215-217, 294-295.
- Iroquois League, 217-218.
- Isolation, tribal, 15-16, 54, 145, 215, 224-225, 252, 257, 271.
- Jingoism, 22.
- King, divine, 168, 170, 171, 172.
- King's peace, 214.
- Lake dwellings, 4, 5.
- Land, 9, 10, 11, 76, 77, 79; ratio of population to, 9-11, 232.
- Language, variations in, 15-16.
- Lex talionis*, 214, 276.
- Magic, 114-117, 123, 156, 272, 274.
- Malthusian doctrine, 10.
- Man hunts, 67.
- Mana*, 104, 239.
- Marriage, 97, 102, 196-198, 220.
- Medicine man, 161, 162, 288, 290.
- Megalomania, 22.
- Message sticks, 183-184.
- Messengers, 177, 183-185, 294-295.
- Migration, 77, 165-166, 220-221; caused by war, 259-260, 261, 262, 263.
- Militarism, 25, 29, 220, 229, 233.
- Military inventions, 226-227.
- Military virtues extolled, 89-43, 105-113, 141-144, 147, 229.
- Monarchies, primitive, 164-173.

- Morals, two codes of, 18-21, 105-106.
- Mores, as unifying force, 17; consistency in, 45, 65-66, 241-243; defined, 12; in-group versus out-group, 89, 105, 122, 271, 273, 274-275; nature of, 28; sanctioned by religion, 12, 104-105; selection in, 220, 222-224, 229-230.
- Morong*, 58, 142.
- Murder, 18, 21, 120-129, 177, 210, 214, 268-277.
- Mutilation, 155-159, 282-284.
- Mythology, 1.
- Native troops, 56, 57.
- Neolithic, implements, 4-5; strongholds, 5.
- Neutral ground, 185, 186.
- "Noble occupations," 29, 83.
- Nomadism, 26, 27, 222-223.
- Noncombatants, 185-186.
- Old, authority of the, 161, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291; killing the, 219.
- Ordeal, 177, 194, 210-211.
- Other world, 105-110, 120-121, 130-131, 140.
- Out-group, *see* In-group.
- Palaver, 177, 205, 208, 265-266, 269, 286, 289.
- Paleolithic implements, 3-4.
- "Peace at any price," 40, 50.
- Peace, ceremonies of, 188-190, 211; king's, 214; of the market, 186, 203; of the temple, 208-209; signs of, 187-188; treaties of, 9, 188-191, 222.
- Peace-federation, 217-218.
- Peace-group, 18, 121, 160; expansion of the, 211-218, 229, 233.
- Peaceful access, 201-202.
- "Pest of glory," 151.
- Piracy, 81, 82, 202.
- Plunder, *see* Booty.
- Poison gas, 228.
- Poisoned weapons tabooed, 182.
- Polygyny, 102, 220.
- Population, 10, 77, 219, 220, 232; law of, 11; policy, 219-220.
- Post propter*, 115, 116.
- Prisoners, 67, 69, 90, 180-181, 192-195, 228; not taken, 179-180, 191, 258; ransomed, 193; sacrificed, 87-88, 74, 111, 181-185; tortured, 193, 297-299; treatment of, 191-195.
- Property, right to, 80, 81.
- Prosperity policy, 12, 220.
- Public health advanced by war, 227-228.
- Race mixture and war, 220-221.
- Religion, and the mores, 11, 12, 104-105; as a cause of war, 55-56, 103-146, 229, 232, 239-241; military advantage of, 107; peaceful effects of, 208-213; primitive concepts of, 19, 103-104, 114, 121, 180, 187-188, 156, 240-241.
- Rights defined, 17-18.
- Running the gauntlet, 194.
- Safe-conduct, 206, 209, 215, 217.
- Scalp lock, 240-241.
- Scalping, 156-157, 284, 297, 298.
- Secret societies, 39, 151, 204-207; peaceful effects of, 206-208.
- Selection in the mores, 220, 222-224, 229-230.
- Self-maintenance, stages of, 76.
- Sex differences, 23-24.
- Sex division of labor, 23-30, 97, 225, 242.
- Sex taboos, 29-30, 239-240.
- Sexes, disproportion in the, 102, 220.
- "Silent barter," 200-201.
- Single combat, 53, 177-179, 244, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250.
- Slavery, 13, 66-67, 75, 89-95, 131, 132, 134, 158, 165-166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 228, 230, 231-232, 256; as mitigation of war, 194-195; in the other world, 108, 131, 140.
- Social classes, 164-166, 171, 172, 173, 174-175, 228-229, 285, 291.
- Social control, 39, 160.
- Socializing forces, 11, 65.
- Society, definition of, 160; primitive, 11, 12, 196.
- Soul, location of, 137, 156, 240-241.
- Sovereignty, 166.

Standard of living, 10-11, 77, 232.
 Standing army, 80, 55, 168-169, 170, 172, 260.
 State and war, 160-175.
 Strangers, hostility toward, 12-15, 19, 20, 21, 117, 121, 128, 212, 213; as friends, 215-216.
 Struggle for existence, 9-11, 12, 16, 46, 49, 76, 77, 80, 104, 160, 230, 232.
 Supernatural agency, 103-104, 114, 121, 130.
 Sword, 6-7, 8, 182, 229.
 Taboo, 18, 80, 114, 120, 160, 207-209, 239.
 Tactics, 53, 55, 60-63, 152, 156, 174, 176, 181, 182-183, 244-250.
 Tattooing, 140, 142, 151-154.
 Temple, peace of the, 208-209.
 Territoriality, 175.
 Trade, 186, 199-203, 224, 232, 233; and civilization, 203; antagonistic to war, 199, 201, 202-203; as alternative to war, 199-202; peaceful effects of, 201, 202-203.
 Treachery, 176; approved, 143-144; condemned, 182-183.
 Treaty of peace, 9, 188-191, 222.
 Trial by oath, 210; by combat, 177-178, 211; by ordeal, 177, 194, 210-211. *See also* Palaver.
 Tribal mark, 123-124, 151, 153.
 Tribal names, meaning of, 22, 234-236.
 Trophies, 81, 140-144, 155-159, 282-284, 297-298, 299.
 Truce, 186-187; of God, 209.
 "Unfair tactics," 181, 182-183.
 Unwarlikeness, 46-53.
 Vanity, 11, 19, 22, 29, 73-74, 90, 140-144, 147-159, 232.
 Virgin, sworn, 31-32, 34.
 Wampum, 184, 190, 295.
 War, absence of, 46-53; among fishers, 79; among herders, 78-79, 82-88; among hunters, 67, 78; among tillers, 79-80; and cannibalism, 67-75; and other institutions,

45, 65-66; and societal selection, 229-231; and the state, 160-175; and women, 96-102; as amusement, 147-149; as man's business, 28-29, 80, 86-45; causes of, 65-66; declaration of, 176-177, 292-296; defined, 12, 46; destructiveness of, 258-264; effect on governmental organization, 162-175, 229; effect on marriage, 102; effect on social organization, 228-229; for booty, 80-95, 265-267; for economic reasons, 66-69, 76-95, 97, 265-267; for glory, 147-159, 278-281, 282-284; for land, 78-80; for religious reasons, 103-146; for slaves, 89-95; for women, 96-101; incessant, 54-58, 144-145, 196, 224, 251-254, 255-257; integrating effect of, 162-175; mild, 48-53, 147-148, 244-250; mitigation of, 176-195; on account of religious differences, 103, 117-119; prevalence of, 1, 9; prevention of, 196-218; promotive of culture, 175, 221-224, 226-228; retarding civilization, 224-225, 231, 233; serious, 54-60, 63-64, 144-145, 230, 258-264; stimulating effect of, 225-226.
 War adornment, 41-42, 141, 142, 154-155, 278-281.
 War chief, 161, 162, 163, 164-175.
 War god, 111-113, 133, 134-135.
 War honors, 41-44, 141-144, 151-155.
 Warfare, code of, 19, 176, 180-183; prehistoric, 1-8; regulated, 177-183; unregulated, 176.
 Warlikeness, 36-37, 54-60, 63-64, 111, 155, 251-254, 255-257; encouraged by women, 101, 140-141; extolled, 39-43, 105-113, 141-144, 147, 229; fostered by religion, 105-113.
 Warriors, apotheosis of, 110-111; special burial given to, 108-110; social prestige of, 36, 39-45, 105-113, 140-142, 147, 151-155, 164-165, 171-173, 229, 242; training of, 36-39, 237-243.
 Weapons, 1, 3-8, 32, 33, 44, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 60-63, 181-182, 226-227, 242, 243, 246.
 Wergeld, 214.

Wife-capture, 26, 96-101, 102, 177, 178, 220.

Witchcraft, 177, 272, 274.

Women, as auxiliaries in war, 34-36;
as instigators of war, 101, 140-141;

as messengers, 183, 184, 197, 198;
as warriors, 30-34, 247, 248; despised because weak, 30, 239; share in division of labor, 23-30, 97, 225, 242; spared, 179-181, 191-192.



3 9000 022 810 852



